

PROCEEDINGS

2007 NCAA® CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS



101st Annual Convention
January 5-8, 2007
Orlando, Florida

PROCEEDINGS

2007 NCAA® CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS



101st Annual Convention
January 5-8, 2007
Orlando, Florida



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

P.O. Box 6222

Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-6222

317/917-6222

NCAA.org

June 2007

NCAA, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.

©2007 by the National Collegiate Athletic Association

Opening Business Session

Saturday, January 6, 2007

The opening business session was called to order at 4:40 p.m. by NCAA Executive Committee Chair Walter Harrison, president of the University of Hartford.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Harrison: Ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to welcome you to the opening session of the 2007 NCAA Convention. I am Walter Harrison, president of the University of Hartford and chair of the NCAA Executive Committee. I have the pleasure of moderating this session and welcoming you to Orlando.

As you go about your business, you will see many communications platforms, including television, print and outdoor advertising being used to highlight the unique values of what President Myles Brand has described as the collegiate model of athletics.

Speaking of the NCAA president, from whom we will hear in a few minutes, it is my pleasure to introduce the individual who is providing outstanding leadership for all of us in the NCAA, President Myles Brand. (Applause)

With me today on the dais are the chairs of the Divisions I, II and III presidential governing bodies. I am pleased to welcome from my right, Phil Austin, University of Connecticut, chair of the Division I Board of Directors; Charles Ambrose, Pfeiffer University, chair of the Division II Presidents Council; and Ivory Nelson, Lincoln University (Pennsylvania), chair of the Division III Presidents Council. We are fortunate that Chuck Ambrose will continue to chair the Division II Presidents Council for another year.

However, Divisions I and III will have new leadership in 2007. I would like to commend Phil Austin and Ivory Nelson for their leadership. Based on the knowledge they have exhibited in leading their respective divisions, I know Phil and Ivory will continue to remain involved in Association activities. I also know how much time and energy goes into leading a division, board or council. I ask you now to please join in thanking them for their service to the Association. (Applause)

MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS

As has been the tradition during the opening business session, the NCAA honors athletics staff members and student-athletes who died during this past year with a memorial resolutions report. A request was sent to directors of athletics and conference commissioners to submit names of individuals from an institution or conference who died during 2006.

The NCAA News publishes notices of these deaths in each issue. I would like to acknowledge the invaluable assistance that we received this year from NCAA staff members Sharon Tufano and Josh Centor in compiling the list.

At this time, I would like to ask you to look at your opening business session program to see the names of those institutional staff members associated with athletics and student-athletes who died in 2006. Please remain seated while we take a few minutes to recognize individuals who passed away in the past year.

[Note: Names on the memorial resolutions list were displayed on the screens adjacent to the dais.]

I ask that all delegates and friends from the media to please stand and observe a moment of silence for those men and women who have passed away since we last met.

[Note: A moment of silence was observed.]

Thank you. If you know of persons who should be added to the list, please contact any member of the national office staff.

REPORT OF NCAA EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

It is customary at this point in the opening business session for the chair to present a report of the NCAA Executive Committee. As many of you know, the NCAA federated governance structure allows each division the autonomy to address its varied issues.

However, it is important for us to keep in mind that we gather annually at this Convention as one Association. The NCAA Executive Committee is composed of 16 presidents and chancellors from the three divisions, the president of the NCAA, three non-voting members and chairs of the Management Councils of Divisions I, II and III.

The Executive Committee's duties and responsibilities include approval of the Association's budget, oversight of Association-wide issues, initiation and settlement of litigation, and employment of the NCAA president. With that in mind, I would like to report on what has been a busy and productive year for the Association.

Last April and August, the Executive Committee determined whether certain institutions should remain on the list of colleges and universities subject to the provisions of the Executive Committee's policy on the use and display of Native American mascots, names and imagery at NCAA championships.

The NCAA mascot policy is fairly simple and straightforward. It was designed to align the core principles of cultural diversity, civility, respect and non-discrimination with the practice of creating an educational environment at NCAA championship events. Its primary purpose is to maintain NCAA championships as an environment that promotes an atmosphere of respect for and sensitivity to the dignity of every person. These are core values, memorialized by the membership and the NCAA constitution and protected by authority granted to the Executive Committee to set policy.

During the past year, the Executive Committee has received progress reports from two working groups established to review issues related to membership eligibility for international institutions and membership growth with particular focus on Divisions II and III.

Both working groups will continue to examine these issues and forthcoming recommendations that require legislative action to be referred to the appropriate divisional governance process.

In August, the Executive Committee received an independent report reviewing the NCAA Division I enforcement and infractions processes and procedures. The report concluded that the procedures provided in the NCAA enforcement hearings, appeals, waiver and reinstatement proceedings compare favorably with federal, administrative and state court processes. Although the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that the NCAA is not subject to due process requirements of the U.S. Constitution, the NCAA nonetheless substantially abides by those requirements. The report was prepared by James C. Duff, former managing partner of Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz in Washington, D.C. He is now the director of the administrative office of the U.S. Courts.

The NCAA engaged Mr. Duff's services in May 2005 to review NCAA investigatory hearing and appeals processes and waiver and student-athlete reinstatement procedures. Mr. Duff's report recommends certain adjustments and procedural changes, many of which are intended to reduce the time and improve operations involved in NCAA enforcement procedures. Several suggestions in the report have already been implemented and all are being considered.

STATE OF THE ASSOCIATION ADDRESS

We now move to what I consider to be the most important moment of the NCAA Convention, the State of the Association address. Please join me in welcoming President Myles Brand. (Applause)

Myles Brand (NCAA President): We are at the midpoint of another academic year, the 101st for the NCAA. The Centennial celebration is complete, and it was grand.

The breadth and diversity of intercollegiate athletics is extraordinary. It stretches from stadiums filled with over 100,000 screaming fans to contests in which the participants outnumber the spectators, from games that command national broadcast attention to others reported only in the local college newspaper. They are all part of a deeply embedded national cultural phenomenon.

Intercollegiate athletics is a success story, and I want to talk about that today.

But any activity this comprehensive, this popular and this emotionally laden is bound to have challenges connected with it. And, as we all know, that is the case for intercollegiate athletics. College sports is truly extraordinary; yet, there are aspects of it that need improvement. And I will also discuss some of those challenges.

It strikes me, however, that the quintessential quality of intercollegiate athletics, and the way in which this Association has come to conduct its business, is a sense of fairness. It is an attribute that is central to the conduct of sports. It is basic.

But it is not simple. The centrality of fairness in intercollegiate athletics will be the unifying theme in all that I discuss today.

Though not complete, academic reform is emerging as a significant success story. The NCAA has been engaged in academic reform of one kind or another for many decades. The current reform initiative began about 20 years ago, picked up momentum with the Knight Commission Report of 1991, and again in the late 1990s with increased presidential involvement, and became a serious point of emphasis for the NCAA in the past few years.

In Division I, initial-eligibility standards are increasing, progress-toward-degree requirements were enhanced to lead to graduation in five years, and new metrics were developed to assess accurately academic performance.

Several features of this reform are especially noteworthy. The new metric, the Academic Progress Rate, focuses on semester-by-semester academic performance. A team's failure to achieve an average score of 925, which correlates to a Graduation Success Rate of 60 percent, results in sanctions, such as the loss of scholarships.

This is the second year the NCAA has calculated semester-by-semester academic performance and the first time it used sanctions to reinforce academic achievement.

When we began this reform effort several years ago, everyone spoke to the need for simple, straightforward rules and policies. That was a worthy goal, since it promoted clarity and broad understanding. But simple is not always fair.

It is unfortunate that, in an effort to treat each team and individual student-athlete fairly, to take into account the significant variations among universities and individual circumstances, simplicity has had to give way.

In the past, to be frank, the Association's bylaws were interpreted and implemented with an emphasis on competitive equity. There was a tendency for the Association to apply its rules rigidly, including its academic standards. Now we place fairness in a priority position. That demands we look carefully at the context and the local environment, that we give student-athletics the benefit of the doubt, and that we focus on improvement within a program rather than punishment.

The goal is to change behavior so student-athletes succeed academically, and issue sanctions only when necessary, and then using good judgment and fairness.

I want to publicly commend the many NCAA staff and committee members who work quietly but very effectively in implementing this new NCAA philosophy.

To additionally enhance accuracy, and thereby fair treatment, the NCAA has substituted its Graduation Success Rate for the federally mandated graduation rate. Division II also began issuing its Academic Success Rate this year, which accounts not only for transfer students, but also those who participate in intercollegiate athletics without scholarship support.

The federal rate is inaccurate. It counts all transfer students as dropouts and failures, and that is simply mistaken. And for Division II, the federal rate significantly undercounts student-athletes because it measures only those who are on financial aid.

In Division I alone, more than 30,000 student-athletes in good academic standing transfer each year. On average, the federal rate undercounts graduation by approximately 14 percentage points.

It is our hope that the Department of Education will adopt this methodology or something relevantly similar. Not only is it more accurate, but the NCAA methodology protects student privacy.

About two months ago, the NCAA released the latest GSR for teams and athletics programs in Division I. It should be obvious to anyone looking at these results objectively that student-athletes are doing well academical-

ly. The GSR for all Division I student-athletes who receive grants-in-aid is 77 percent, an improvement of one percentage point from last year. Young men graduate on average at 70 percent and young women graduate on average at 86 percent.

I have set an unofficial goal of 80 percent as an average for all student-athletes in Division I. I believe we can achieve that degree of success in the next few years, as the academic reform initiatives mature. That would mean four out of five student-athletes graduate within the six-year window. That result would be truly extraordinary.

“DUMB JOCK” APPELLATION IS DEAD WRONG

There is little that frustrates me more than critics of college sports who get the facts wrong and make derogatory comments about the academic accomplishments of student-athletes. Overall, student-athletes graduate at higher rates than the general student body, and that is true in almost every demographic category.

Of course, not every group graduates above the national average—this is not Lake Wobegon. Critics pounce on the point that football and male basketball student-athletes graduate at lower rates than the general male student population. They are right, and improvement is needed. But they very often fail to note some key exceptions and overall improvement.

For example, compare the rates of African-American football and male basketball student-athletes with those of the general African-American male population. These student-athletes do better by 12 points in football and five points in basketball. The GSR rates for African-American football and men’s basketball are 55 and 51 percent, respectively. African-American males and females are considerably out-performing their counterparts in the student body. We do need to do better in higher education in graduating African-Americans; but in athletics, we have, in fact, made genuine progress.

I challenge the critics of college sports, in the media and on campus, to get their facts right.

It is no mystery why student-athletes perform better academically than the general student body. First, they tend to enter college better prepared.

The average GPA of entering Division I student-athletes, for the most recent year in which we have data, is 3.35, modestly higher than that for the general student body. The entering SAT scores for student-athletes is 1,059, while that of the entering general student body is 1,026. That’s a significant difference—33 points.

The appellation “dumb jock” is not only insulting, it is dead wrong.

When student-athletes come to the university today, they often find assistance from academic professionals and good study facilities. It was not too long ago that the NCAA passed regulations designed to eliminate the use of drugs, sex and alcohol in the recruitment process. Today, athletics departments are attracting student-athletes by demonstrating a commitment to academic support. They are bragging to the student-athletes and their parents about their teams’ graduation rates—and that is a good thing.

Student-athletes also tend to be highly motivated. They learn quickly how to manage their time. They have an immediate peer group, the team, which limits the alienation many entering college students feel and which is the single most important factor in retention. Coaches, more and more, are encouraging student-athletes to apply themselves academically and are recruiting student-athletes who are more likely to have academic success. All this increases the likelihood of success in the classroom.

In short, a large majority of student-athletes are receiving a fine education and graduating from our colleges and universities. Let us give them and their institutions the credit they deserve. Of course, there are also institutions and programs that need to do better. We cannot be satisfied until the under-performing programs reach acceptable levels.

I call on the critics to stop maligning the majority of student-athletes—including those in football and men’s basketball—who are doing well. And these same critics should refrain from misrepresenting the success of our higher education institutions.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

These results in academic reform required persistent long-term efforts of many, including university presidents. The same effort will be required to address the complicated and vexing issue of college athletics costs.

About two years ago, we called on the presidents—as we had with academic reform—to consider the future of Division I athletics. Fifty chancellors and presidents composed a task force charged with setting an agenda for the future of Division I, and relatedly for the other divisions. I had the privilege to announce the recommendations of these presidents at the National Press Club recently.

Their recommendations included a prioritized list of critical topics on student-athlete well-being and financial aid to be considered by the Association's governance bodies; good practices for dealing with institutional governing boards and alumni clubs; and a clear commitment to fairness in hiring and in athletics participation. Of these, I want first to discuss the topic that took center stage in the report, namely the call for increased fiscal responsibility.

Many Division I institutions face financial stress in athletics. The problem is not at a crisis stage, and it is unlikely it will reach that point, but clearly there are athletics programs facing economic stress.

Let's be clear: Over the last decade, only six institutions consistently have had athletics revenue surpluses at the end of the year—half a dozen programs. These few are not facing stress. They are setting the pace. They make most of the news about money in college sports. But they are not wondering how they will make budget.

A second group of programs—only another six to eight—require some institutional support, but their subsidy is within reasonable limits, about five percent of their budget. This level of support doesn't strain the overall institutional mission.

While there is some mobility among the remaining institutions, most are experiencing annual deficits in excess of five percent. In fact, 52 percent of all Division I institutions that sponsor football at the Bowl Subdivision level require subsidies greater than five percent every year. For these institutions, keeping up with the pace means ever-increasing subsidies and institutional investments for facilities that could have long-term financial impact.

The spending behaviors at the Bowl Subdivision level impact those three categories of institutions differently, and that is where the concern rises. Consider coaches' compensation, for example. The institutions with revenues exceeding expenses have clearly responded to a changed compensation market.

Frankly, it can be argued the increases in both gross and net revenues attributed to the success of a new coaching regime is a sound investment. As USA Today reported earlier this fall, a handful of institutions with seven-figure head-coaching compensation packages have experienced returns in the tens of millions. These increased revenues mean that broad athletics opportunities can continue without institutional support.

But keeping pace for those institutions where modest institutional subsidies are necessary has not resulted in sufficient return to move the athletics programs to a self-sustaining level: Spending more has not meant sufficiently more revenue to reduce subsidies.

The remaining, heavily subsidized programs throughout all of Division I face even more difficult times.

Indeed, the debt-service for facilities and the other costs of trying to keep up exacerbates the problem. For the programs at greatest risk, these new investments outrun any increases in revenue in the short term and leave heavy mortgages for facilities in the long term.

The underlying problem is the rate of increase of athletics expenditures exceeds by a factor of two to four the rate of increase of nonathletics expenditures on these campuses. At the same time, the rate of increases of athletics department revenues that, in the recent past, exceeded that of the campus as a whole has now started to level off. As a result, these athletics departments are being inevitably squeezed and they will require additional subsidy in the future.

These financial strains are coming at a time when campuses, most especially public universities, are being asked to do more with less funding. There is national recognition that higher education needs to become more accessible to low-income students.

That recognition will continue the trend of pressure against raising tuition. State funding for higher education continues to suffer from competition with needs in K-12 education, the criminal justice system, health care and other entitlement programs.

For a number of years, the federal government has not increased Pell grants for need-based financial aid—though that might begin to change with new leadership in Congress. All in all, most universities will find increasing the subsidies for athletics difficult.

I am not arguing that athletics subsidies should be eliminated, or even that the goal for Division I athletics departments in all cases is to balance their budgets without subsidy. The few institutions that have the advantage of large stadiums and fan bases, excellent media contracts and wealthy donors, manage without subsidies.

Other athletics departments, which do not have these advantages, require subsidies. We should not push them to be overly aggressive, to undertake activities that could embarrass the institution or exploit student-athletes, in order to accrue additional revenues and eliminate subsidies.

For that reason, the task force recommended the philosophical principle about the need to produce revenue be reworded so it is not interpreted as a mandate that almost anything goes in raising funds for athletics. Of course, like every other campus unit, there is a responsibility to generate revenue; but it should be done with good judgment and an awareness of the mission of higher education.

The Presidential Task Force understood the limitations of the NCAA national office in managing the financing of intercollegiate athletics. While it was not only possible, but was more effective to manage academic reform on a national basis, fiscal responsibility is a campus matter. The NCAA national office cannot set the budgets for individual institutions without the risk of violating Sherman antitrust law.

Rather, the Presidential Task Force recognized that the NCAA national office could best provide assistance to its members by developing financial information that would be useful in local decision-making. The NCAA worked with university business offices through their national association, NACUBO, to develop new definitions and systems for financial data collection, in which there would be apples-to-apples comparisons. This is a major step forward.

Additionally, the task force recommended there be increased transparency in the aggregate and a simplified means of tracking trends through so-called dashboard indicators. A number of these recommendations have been put in place; some others will require NCAA legislative action, and that process has already begun.

Three groups must work with the presidents if substantial campus-based change is to occur. First, the athletics administrators, most especially the athletics directors, are key to the process. As the business of college sports becomes more complex, and as additional financial pressures are focused on athletics departments, the role of the athletics director becomes more difficult and more vital to the success of the program. These are tough jobs and the people who are in charge of our athletics departments, the athletics directors, deserve significant recognition for their high level of professionalism and their commitment to student-athletes and institutional success.

Second, presidents need the support of the faculty to make these changes on campus. Meeting the challenges of intercollegiate athletics requires an informed, engaged faculty. The faculty athletics representatives, in particular, play a central role in bridging the worlds of athletics and academics.

I am encouraged by the rising presence of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, which now includes the faculty senates on more than 50 Division I campuses. COIA is poised to stand with the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association as significant allies for presidents in addressing these fiscal issues.

The third group is the governing body—the regents or trustees. The governing body of a university has fiduciary responsibility and ultimate authority for policy. The task force was greatly assisted by the Association of Governing Boards in reinforcing that board members should focus on athletics policy, rather than direct management intervention.

The recommendations of the task force were designed specifically for Division I. However, the philosophic stance taken by the Task Force is also applicable to Divisions II and III. Intercollegiate athletics is to be integrated in the mission and operation of the campus; student-athletes are to be recognized as students first and their academic success is paramount; and athletics must be conducted in a fiscally responsible manner.

SPORTSMANSHIP AS FAIR PLAY

I want to spend the balance of my time this afternoon talking about three challenges we must face in college sports, each of which concerns fairness.

The first is one that rarely gets its due—sportsmanship.

This fall saw several fights on the football field, which portrayed the sport, the schools and the players in

unfavorable lights. In the worst cases, they involved intentional acts of harm to opponents.

These incidents were ugly to watch, and they provided grist for the cynical mill of commentators and reporters. In one case, it touched off a media firestorm of criticism and second-guessing about the severity of the sanctions to the involved student-athletes.

However, few among the critics got the story right. They focused on the need for harsher penalties. But by doing so, they missed the main point.

The real problem is that such student-athlete behavior illustrates a failure to have internalized the values of sportsmanship. Only a deep, personal commitment to sportsmanship can best the urge to initiate such behavior or join the fray. This commitment, importantly, must be established long before it is tested on the field.

This is a significant responsibility and challenge for intercollegiate athletics.

The presidents of the involved institutions did understand the real issue. In addition to missed games, they prescribed community service. On the surface, this may appear to be a tepid response to outrageous behavior.

But the presidents knew what they were doing. They wanted to use community service to teach respect for others, and respect for others is an essential part of sportsmanship.

Simply put, sportsmanship is essential to the proper conduct of intercollegiate athletics. It is the manifestation of good character within the context of competitive athletics.

One central reason for the acceptance of intercollegiate athletics as part of the academy is that it teaches development of student-athletes as citizens in a civil society. Without the developmental growth connected with sports participation, the reasons to connect intercollegiate athletics with a university education would be significantly diminished.

What, then, is sportsmanship? Let me say, before answering that question, that I take this term to include both genders, despite its male reference.

Now, it seems to me that there are two necessary conditions of sportsmanship as it applies to competitive athletics contests, especially those that are part of intercollegiate athletics. Sportsmanship, no doubt, is a complex concept, and I do not mean to provide an exhaustive explanation; but the following features capture the heart of the phenomenon.

First, a student-athlete exercises sportsmanship only if he or she respects others with whom and against whom he or she competes. It does not matter whether the sport is an individual one, such as track and field or wrestling, or a team one, such as softball or football.

To show respect for an opponent does not diminish the competitiveness involved in sport. Indeed, if one does not maximize competitiveness, then that is disrespectful; to not give full effort, to not do one's best is to say, implicitly at least, the opponent is not fully worthy. In the case of contact sports, such as football, to show respect is perfectly compatible with hard play.

But, for the sportsman, full effort and hard play must be done with a commitment to fairness. Fair play means more than merely abiding by the explicit rules of the game. Every sport has explicit rules for competition and for safety; but each sport also has implicit conventions about fair play and respect for opponents. Given the differences among sports, these implicit rules vary considerably, but they all pertain to the way players treat each other.

Second, a student-athlete exercises sportsmanship only if he or she respects the game. That means respecting the code of ethics and conventions surrounding the game. For example, while it is permissible—though it does not incur a penalty—to foul someone going in for a lay-up late in a game, it is not permissible, according to basketball's conventions, to foul more aggressively than necessary to disrupt the shot.

Importantly, the game is disrespected when a student-athlete cheats. Some cheating involves intentionally breaking the rules of the game, such as using illegal equipment, say a corked bat. But some cheating has more to do with student-athlete behavior that affects the competition.

Using performance-enhancing drugs is an example of this latter type of cheating. In that case, an athlete attempts to gain an unfair advantage by using artificial means. It is disrespectful to the traditions and code of conduct of a sport to compete on a drug-assisted basis. It shows the participant places personal success beyond all considerations, and he or she disregards the commitment to fair play.

The NCAA has, for some time, been diligent in enforcing rules against the use of performance-enhancing drugs. The NCAA tests in Divisions I and II, and Division III has begun a serious pilot study that involves testing.

Similarly, gambling on college sports disrespects the game. Our American culture tolerates a high level of gambling; there are some municipalities and states in which gambling is legal. Poker has turned into a national pastime, with adolescents among the most prolific participants.

Be that as it may, wagering on college games by those engaged in intercollegiate athletics, especially student-athletes themselves, creates the threat of illicit influences on the outcome of games. One of the key reasons why college sports is popular is the games have credibility and no one knows their outcome in advance. They are fair contests. If the outcomes are manipulated by point shaving, for instance, the credibility on which they are based evaporates. I believe there is little, if anything, that would be more harmful to college sports than systematic intrusion of gambling interests.

Sportsmanship applies not only to participants, student-athletes, but also to others associated with college sports. Among those are the coaches and officials, athletics and university administrators, fans and boosters, and the media. The core elements of sportsmanship are relevant to all: namely, respect for the participants and respect for the game.

One critical group is the fans. College sports fans, survey research has shown, are among the most avid. Their commitment to their university or college team is often intense, lifelong, and carried with great pride. That is good. Being a college sports fan is enjoyable; it builds bonding with others and with the institution. It offers a cathartic outlet for the pressures of modern life.

Avid fan behavior, however, has a dark side. It can become unruly, even dangerous at times. It is fine for fans to cheer loudly for their teams; but it is unsportsmanlike to hurl derogatory, demeaning epithets at opposing players.

It is fine to stand and shout at critical moments, but it is potentially dangerous to charge on to the field and pull down the goal posts. It is fine to tailgate before the game, to party after the game; but it is unacceptable to have celebratory riots in which fires are set, property is destroyed, and drunken mobs roam the streets.

How are we to promote and reinforce sportsmanship? How are we to deal with the egregious failures of sportsmanship—for example, team fighting and fan celebratory riots?

The answer is far easier to articulate than to put successfully into practice. Sportsmanship is learned through education. The good news is that no one is better at education than universities. But sportsmanship must be taught continually. The task is never done, in part because the players and the student fans change every year.

Aristotle argued that one becomes virtuous by doing virtuous acts. That is, the underlying attitudes leading one to act virtuously begins by undertaking the right behaviors until they become habitual. The attitudes necessary for sportsmanship must be nurtured, taught and reinforced.

Athletes new to the team must be told what is expected of them. Coaches, of course, are key to this process, but mature peers, older players, also have a role to play. Athletics directors and professional support personnel must set the expectations and reinforce the right behaviors.

The NCAA has been actively involved in the teaching of all aspects of sportsmanship for some time. It promotes and supports campus-based educational programs concerned with fair play, nutrition and health, and gambling abstention. Among its major programs are CHAMPS/Life Skills, APPLE and Don't Bet On It. In addition, a new Web site offers best practices and the "Everyone's A Player" campaign highlights respect, responsibility and integrity. Nonetheless, it is not likely these national programs are sufficient to teach sportsmanship. Campus-based instruction, both formal and informal, is critical to successful learning.

Universities have recently taken steps to minimize disruptive fan behavior and to increase safety. For example, schools better manage crowds trying to charge the field or court—and safer collapsible goal posts; law enforcement is better prepared; and city and municipal government, and the media are more cooperative.

In the end, individual campuses must decide which practices work best in their environments. They must understand and act on the effective strategies to prepare for the big game; they must manage the game to best ensure the safety of players, coaches, officials and fans, and if necessary, mete out fair, consistent but strong punishments for those who are ill-behaved.

The task facing campuses is made more difficult by a culture that often accepts, even encourages, sports fan misbehavior. It is important for leadership both inside and outside the university to counter this untoward perspective.

In sum, sportsmanship is a central element in college athletics. Good sportsmanship reinforces the positive nature of intercollegiate athletics. It demonstrates character development by student-athletes, the role of coaches as teachers and mentors, and it adds to the pleasure of college fans. But poor sportsmanship reflects poorly on all those engaged in intercollegiate athletics.

FAIRNESS IN HIRING

Fairness continues to be a topic of central concern to the NCAA in other areas, as well. I appointed the Diversity Leadership Strategic Planning Committee to help set the agenda for future progress. The committee is reporting its findings and recommendations at this Convention. We appreciate the good work and sound insight of the committee members.

Let me turn, finally, to two challenges to fairness discussed by this committee.

The two challenges are: fairness in hiring and fairness in student-athlete participation.

In men's basketball, a critical mass of head coaches are African-American. That has permitted upward mobility for young coaches who are African-American, as well as opportunities to change positions for experienced head coaches.

Unfortunately, in football we have not yet seen this type of upward mobility or opportunities. Indeed, the proportion of ethnic minority head football coaches is inexcusably low.

In the case of athletics directors and other high-level athletics administration posts, we see similar problems for women and people of color.

Fortunately, there is some recent modest improvement. The number of head football coaches has increased from three to seven over the past few years, and the number of athletics directors who are ethnic minorities or women has showed good increases. The most encouraging change is that ethnic minorities and women are receiving more interviews and they are appearing on the final lists of candidates more often.

Nonetheless, much remains to be accomplished before equity is obtained. The simple fact of the matter is that there are highly qualified, hard-working persons waiting for a chance to be successful. In the competitive environment that is college sports, it remains unjustifiable that the most qualified person does not get the job.

Individual institutions are wholly responsible for the hiring of coaches and administrators. That is as it should be. No outside body, such as the NCAA, should usurp the authority or responsibility of universities and colleges in hiring.

But having said that, it must also be recognized that practices in hiring are prerequisites to fairness and which leads to the best search results. The central point is that the recruitment and evaluation of candidates must be truly open and inclusive.

How can the NCAA be most helpful in the search for head football coaches of color and for athletics administrators, especially athletics directors? First, the NCAA should call attention to these problem areas and make known the best practices for high-level searches.

Second, the NCAA should help prepare candidates for the search process. The NCAA conducts 19 programs annually to provide practical and professional education and advice to candidates. These programs range from academies for relative beginners to advanced levels, and include opportunities for both men and women. Hundreds of individuals have gone through these programs during the last five years.

I take personally the responsibility for calling public attention to the dimensions of this problem—as I am doing now. I will continue to do so. And the NCAA will continue to sponsor educational opportunities to prepare candidates.

FAIRNESS IN PARTICIPATION

The second issue concerning fairness is student-athlete participation. In particular, consider the implementation of Title IX.

Since 1972, the number of young women participating in college sports has increased five-fold, to more than 165,000. As good as that is, it remains short of the goal of full implementation of Title IX.

But what does full implementation mean? In simple terms, it means no college student with skills and interest in athletics participation should be denied the opportunity because of gender.

Recent attacks on Title IX have been directed against its full implementation. The most recent one, initiated by the Department of Education, seeks to ease compliance by permitting the results of an e-mail survey of the student body to demonstrate that interest among young women—the under-represented gender—is being satisfied. But even a well-constructed survey can at best be a partial answer. Such campus surveys are notoriously unreliable, especially when a lack of response is taken to be a negative response.

The NCAA Executive Committee passed and publicized a resolution that clearly and strongly advised against the Department of Education approach. By and large, colleges and universities have not adopted that approach, but a few institutions have done so. It would be appropriate for those that have used the Department of Education's survey to reconsider and re-evaluate its means of complying with Title IX.

It should not be the case that men's participation opportunities are diminished to comply with Title IX. The best way to meet the requirements of Title IX is to increase opportunities for women.

Specifically, I certainly hope that no university cuts sports in order to comply with Title IX. There are always alternatives, and the NCAA staff is ready and able to work with an athletics department to identify acceptable alternatives to cutting sports.

Despite financial pressures, an investment in intercollegiate athletics to assure proper compliance with Title IX is appropriate. Participation in athletics for young women, as it is for young men, provides opportunities for personal growth in terms of attitudes and experiences that lead to successful careers and citizenship. If we provide these opportunities for growth to young men, how can we, in good conscience, deny them to young women? Young women deserve all the opportunities afforded to young men.

The challenge to maximize fairness for all needs to remain high on the NCAA agenda. While there is progress in some areas, much remains to be accomplished.

Over the past 100 years, intercollegiate athletics has become a great American institution. Its successes considerably outweigh the problems and challenges.

But there are responsibilities to the position accorded college sports both within higher education and society as a whole. We must continue to celebrate and honor the student-athlete. We must ensure the mission of educating student-athletes is primary. We must conduct intercollegiate athletics with fiscal integrity. And we must be committed to a guiding philosophy that in all our endeavors, intercollegiate athletics is fair.

Let's begin the 101st year of the NCAA with these responsibilities clearly in mind. In all cases, let us be guided by a firm commitment to fairness. I thank you.

Mr. Harrison: Thank you, Myles, for your very thorough review of the state of the Association and the challenges that you have presented to us for the future. For those of you who would like a copy of the address, it is available on TV at www.ncaa.org, and it will be reprinted in the January 15 issue of The NCAA News. Also, for the first time, the State of the Association address is being simultaneously Web cast for the media.

NCAA PRESIDENT'S GERALD R. FORD AWARD

Before I ask Dr. Brand to return to the podium to present the NCAA President Gerald R. Ford Award, please join me in reflecting on the life of Gerald Ford, a former student-athlete and President of the United States.

[Note: A video on the life of President Ford was shown.]

Mr. Brand: It is my great pleasure to present the annual NCAA President's Gerald R. Ford Award. The award has special meaning to the presentation this year with the passing during the holidays of the 38th President for

whom this award is named. Gerald R. Ford passed away December 26 at the age of 93. He served his country well and long with great integrity and dignity.

The NCAA President's Gerald R. Ford Award was created in 2003 to honor an individual who has provided significant leadership as an advocate for intercollegiate athletics on a continuous basis over the course of his or her career.

Today's honoree, the fifth individual to receive the award, fits the requirement perfectly. Gerald R. Ford served America as its President during one of the most tumultuous periods of this nation's political history. He was a student-athlete at the University of Michigan, where he participated on the national championship football teams in 1932 and 1933. It was there at one of America's great universities that he acquired the qualities he would exhibit throughout a career of public service.

These qualities, integrity, discipline to purpose and sacrifice for the greater good, served him well in a presidency that began in controversy and required great strength of character. This "accidental" President, never elected to the office of either Vice President or President, nevertheless healed the nation with a simple declaration that a long nightmare was over. And so it was. He is then and will continue to be an example of how participation in intercollegiate athletics can shape leaders for critical times.

The 2007 recipient of the President's Award is also an example of an individual who is thrust into a position of leadership not because she sought it, but because she saw a struggle that needed fighters, a wrong that needed to be righted.

A field hockey coach in her native Scotland and then in Canada, Dr. Christine H.B. Grant was a director of athletics in 1973, a year after Title IX became the law of the land. But her contributions to women's athletics stretched well beyond her 27 years at Iowa.

Christine is a pioneer, an advocate, an educator and a champion for the value of athletic participation in the development of young people—both women and men. But her staunch and stalwart determination to see that Title IX be implemented in higher education has helped to change the intercollegiate athletics landscape.

Hers is a long dedication to the simple principle that no one should be denied the right to participate in athletics because of gender. The more than 165,000 women who play sports today as student-athletes can take their opportunity to compete as a matter of course because Christine Grant never did.

A founding member and president of the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women, she also served as president of the National Association of Collegiate Women Athletics Administrators from 1987 to 1989.

Christine, you are the giant on whose shoulders stand today women student-athletes.

[Note: A video on the life of Ms. Grant was shown.]

Mr. Brand: Our recipient of the 2007 Award, Dr. Christine Grant.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

RESPONSE—CHRISTINE GRANT

Ms. Grant: Thank you so much for that warm welcome. When I first heard of the death of President Ford, I had just finished drafting what I might say today. So for that reason, it was especially a sad and poignant moment for me.

He was such a good man, such an honorable man, and such a subtly, decent man. In many ways, President Ford epitomizes the saying it is not whether you win or lose, it is how you play the game. That is ultimately the most important thing.

Because of who he was and what he stood for, this award will always be a very special honor to me. I know that all of us are thankful that President Myles Brand had the vision to create this award during President Ford's lifetime. I am also greatly honored to be receiving this award because last year at the Convention I watched two very special people receive it: Senator Birch Bayh, who helped draft Title IX and who has protected the legislation for more than 30 years in order to ensure that our daughters and our granddaughters are treated in the same fashion as our sons and grandsons in all of our educational programs, including athletics; and John Wooden, who is one of the legends in coaching. He could so easily be a legend because of the great success of his teams a few

decades ago. But much more importantly to him and to those who aspire to model themselves after him, is his commitment to an educational philosophy of sport and a humanistic philosophy of sport designed to help young people through sport to develop into responsible adults who contribute positively to our society. I so strongly believe that that is the primary mission of intercollegiate athletics. I so respect coach Wooden for repeatedly reminding us of that fact.

The reason I relate so well to both of them is because I have tried throughout my professional life to strive for equal opportunity for girls and women in sports, like Senator Bayh, while simultaneously advocating a very similar philosophy to that of coach Wooden. Senator Bayh and coach Wooden were and still are my role models because of their principles and their beliefs, and that makes them very special to me.

Somewhere I read that if you love what you do, then you will never work a day in your life. That's what I have done almost throughout my entire career. I have loved teaching, I have loved coaching and I have loved being an administrator on most days. You may not believe this, but I have also greatly loved being on committees that had challenging agendas.

The reason I mention committee work is because I know that that type of service can change our national policies for the better and sometimes even change beliefs or attitudes. One of my very favorite assignments was being the chair of the Amateurism and Agents Committee because I was forced to re-examine my philosophy about amateurism, which incidentally had been ingrained in me in Britain.

I did re-examine it totally. It was fascinating to discover I could not justify to myself what had been my beliefs on amateurism for almost all of my life. It was one of the best learning experiences I have ever had. I hope that many here will take advantage of opportunities to work on committees, because right now I believe we need our best minds and our most creative minds working on issues such as those mentioned by President Brand—the escalating costs of athletics programs, the development of diverse and inclusive athletics departments, the attainment of gender-equitable programs, and the development of practical ideas on how we can retain our men's Olympic sports in Division I so that we maximize participation opportunities for both women and for men.

I think we owe that to our student-athletes, to our institutions and to our organization. At this time, I would like to thank President Brand for providing such excellent leadership on these and other very difficult issues.

I also mention committee work because for 30 years I have had the great privilege of working with some of the very best men and women associated with intercollegiate athletics in this country. What a privilege that has been. I have been truly blessed to have made so many friends in this room and across this country, and all were made through sports.

Since sport has made my life so very rich throughout the decades, I would like to accept this award on behalf of all who have also worked for equal opportunity in athletics. I would especially mention Charlotte West, Judy Sweet, Donna Lopiano and Bonnie Slatton, who have been my colleagues and friends for more than 30 years.

However, and they would agree with the statement, it truly has been a collective effort by so many good people in this country. I am only a very small part of this venture, but I sincerely thank you for this great honor. (Applause)

Mr. Harrison: Congratulations again, Dr. Grant, on this well-deserved honor.

I want to remind you all of the reception that follows this presentation. Before we go there, let's have one more round of applause for Christine Grant, the Gerald R. Ford Award recipient. (Applause)

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for attending. Enjoy the Convention and your time in Orlando. This session is adjourned.

[The opening business session was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.]

HONORS CELEBRATION

SUNDAY, JANUARY 7, 2007

The 42nd NCAA Honors Celebration was called to order by Executive Committee Chair Walter Harrison, president of the University of Hartford.

WELCOME

Mr. Harrison: Good evening ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to the 42nd annual NCAA Honors Celebration.

It is our honor to recognize current and former NCAA student-athletes who have combined natural talents with determination and perseverance for success. They have used their strength and humility to their advantage in athletics, business and service. They have parlayed cooperation and commitment into leadership roles on their campuses, in their companies and in their communities.

With greatness comes responsibility, and the men and women we will meet tonight espouse the NCAA ideals of sportsmanship, integrity and academic and athletic excellence. It is our pleasure and honor to recognize their dedication as NCAA student-athletes and their leadership as professionals and community servants.

As part of last year's NCAA Centennial celebration, the NCAA commissioned internationally acclaimed composer Alan Silverstri to capture the spirit of the NCAA student-athlete experience through music. Silverstri is well-known for creating soundtracks for movies such as "Back to the Future," "Forest Gump," "Contact," "Castaway" and "Polar Express," just to name a few. Winner of a Grammy Award and a Cable Ace Award, as well as numerous Academy Award and Golden Globe nominations, Silverstri was selected to create an NCAA theme that compliments the educational mission that embodies the passion, excitement, integrity and balance that is college sports.

You had a chance to see the theme come to life in the video that opened tonight's show, and you will have a chance to hear portions of it again throughout the program.

As the NCAA begins its second century of leadership in the changing landscape of intercollegiate athletics, it is appropriate for me to recognize several of its leaders who have played a role in tonight's event.

First and foremost, please recognize NCAA President Myles Brand, whose outstanding leadership of our Association sets a perfect example for all of our student-athletes.

Next, please help me thank the members of the NCAA Honors Committee for their work in selecting tonight's distinguished award recipients. Members of the committee are: from the Ohio Athletic Conference, committee chair Timothy Gleason; from the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Conference, Thomas Brown; NCAA president emeritus, Cedric Dempsey; from Western Carolina University, Gibbs Knotts; from the America East Conference, my conference, Julie Power-Ruppert; and from Wake Forest University, Barbara Walker.

Former Silver Anniversary winner Calvin Hill of Yale University, and University of California, Los Angeles, Olympian Jackie Joyner-Kersey, were unable to be with us tonight.

Thanks to each of you for your work in examining the credentials of many NCAA student-athletes and selecting from those our distinguished honorees. (Applause)

Ladies and gentlemen, the NCAA lost a former student-athlete and an avid sportsman, and our country lost a true public servant upon the passing of former President Gerald R. Ford late last month. A former football letterman and an all-American center at the University of Michigan, President Ford was the NCAA 1975 Theodore Roosevelt Award winner in recognition of his political service in both the U.S. House of Representatives and as the 38th President of the United States. President Ford embodies the values that intercollegiate athletics stands for, and it is fitting that one of our highest honors is named for him.

At yesterday's opening business session, NCAA President Myles Brand presented the Gerald R. Ford Award to Dr. Christine Grant, former director of women's athletics at the University of Iowa. The award is presented to a person who has shown significant leadership during his or her career as an advocate for intercollegiate athletics.

Anyone who has had the honor of working with Dr. Grant knows that her life's work has involved creating opportunities for women to compete in intercollegiate athletics. She has worked to draft Title IX legislation and

she was a founding member of the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women.

She played and coached field hockey in her native Scotland, and after completing her bachelor's, master's and doctoral degrees at Iowa, she led a women's athletics department that won a combined 27 Big Ten Conference titles in 12 NCAA championship sports. Ladies and gentlemen, please help me congratulate Christine Grant. (Applause)

INTRODUCTION OF MASTER OF CEREMONIES

Mr. Harrison: As we begin tonight's show, it is my pleasure to introduce our master of ceremonies for the evening. Joining us for the third year as our Honors Celebration host, please welcome someone who has been intimately involved with this event not only as a host but also as a former Silver Anniversary Award winner and member of the Honors Committee, former Yale football player and two-time Emmy award-winning broadcaster, Jack Ford. (Applause)

TOP VIII AWARDS

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, good evening. I am Jack Ford and it is my honor once again to be a host for this very special event.

How do you experience this evening as both a former honoree and host? I have come to realize just what a special and extraordinary night this is, because it is a celebration of the lives and achievements of those who have truly understood what it means to be both a student and an athlete, and to succeed in both.

We have learned over the years that the collegiate playing field can become some of America's greatest classrooms; however, playing experiences are bound by the rules of the game, the margin of the field and also by the short amount of time we have as student-athletes.

We have also realized that those experiences journey with us throughout our lives and expand exponentially as we age, helping us to sculpt our values and shape the contours of who we are and what we are to become.

You will see this evening with our honorees that they are indeed the shining stars in this incandescent organization in a gathering of accomplished student-athletes. You will see a great deal of differences here—differences in age, differences in time, differences in sporting attire.

You will see differences in sports and academic accomplishments and career choices, but you will see several compelling similarities. You will see a gathering of student-athletes, and when we talk about student-athletes, we can feel free to reference the words of Albeer Conemaugh, who was a French philosopher and poet and an accomplished athlete as a youth.

He once said that all he most surely knows about morality and the duty of man he learned from sports. I suspect that all of our honorees this evening will share in those sentiments. They also share in the fact that they have not just the willingness, but a passion to give back to their communities. You will see those traits as you learn about each and every one of them.

That certainly brings to mind the words appropriately enough of Teddy Roosevelt, for whom the NCAA highest award is named.

Teddy Roosevelt was asked by a common citizen: "What can I do? I don't hold office. I am not a powerful person. What can I do to help others?" Teddy Roosevelt responded simply: "You can do whatever you can with whatever you have wherever you are." You will see that our honorees this evening have done that and much, much more.

Tonight's 2007 Honors Celebration is sure to capture your hearts and souls as we meet amazing individuals—both current and former NCAA student-athletes—who, by their actions and by their heroics, have taken the mantle of leadership to the next level.

Tonight, our recognition of 17 men and women will take us from the classroom, to the playing fields and arenas, to the board room, into the operating room, and even on to the battlefield. As student-athletes, our honorees were leaders, demanding excellence of themselves and from their teammates while earning respect from their competitors.

Even though they attended different universities and participated in different sports, the common ground they share is the NCAA student-athlete experience. From that NCAA experience, they developed leadership qualities, strength, courage, cooperation and determination, perseverance, guidance, commitment, and humility.

Each of our honorees has used these characteristics as a standard to better their teams and their alma maters and to define themselves as leaders for today and tomorrow.

While tonight's celebration focuses on yesterday's successes and today's accomplishments, it is obvious that our award recipients are the leaders of tomorrow. Tonight, we will recognize the NCAA Top VIII, eight outstanding student-athletes who have completed their eligibility, and the NCAA Silver Anniversary Award recipients, six distinguished former student-athletes on the 25th anniversary of their graduation.

We will present the NCAA Inspiration Award and the Award of Valor, two honorees whose stories will certainly move you. Finally, we will present the NCAA highest honor, the Theodore Roosevelt Award.

Last year marked the NCAA Centennial. Tonight, the second century of leadership and excellence begins.

NCAA INSPIRATION AWARD

The first award to be presented tonight is one that is not given every year. Rather, it is reserved for special circumstances and incredible people who, when confronted with a life-altering situation, used dogged determination and commitment to overcome an obstacle and in the process served as a role model to others.

This year's award winner says a life-changing injury opened doors for him "literally and figuratively."

Audiovisual: The character of a champion is often revealed in the face of adversity. Never was that more true than for Dave Denniston. An extraordinary athlete, Dave Denniston was a natural in the pool. As a swimmer at Auburn University, Denniston was a three-time NCAA champion. Balancing a busy academic schedule, Denniston was named captain of the Tiger's swim team in 2000 and 2001, and was a part of the 2003 U.S. World Championship team.

With so much going for him, Denniston's seemingly limitless future suffered a stunning fracture. All I could get out was: "Help. I couldn't even breathe. I was scared, the most scared I have ever been in my life. It was the first time I actually thought I might be dying."

On February 6, 2005, while sledding with a friend in Wyoming, Denniston lost control of his sled and slammed back first into a tree. With a broken back, Denniston underwent emergency surgery. After surgery, Denniston was told he may never walk again. Instead of resigning himself to the prognosis, Denniston joined "Project Walk," a spinal cord injury recovery program and set his goals high.

On the one-year anniversary of the accident his goal was to take 100 steps. He took 163.

"With swimming, you can't explain it, but there was a magic, and it's the same thing. Once I have a goal and I know I am performing, something else that I can't control clicks."

In 2005, Denniston put his communications degree to work and started Mind Over Body, a motivational program dedicated to discovering and applying the positive experiences in everyday life. He now travels the country sharing his story with thousands of people.

"Before my accident, I was training as hard as I could to make my body perfect, but my attitude was paralyzed. This accident has switched things around. I may be paralyzed physically, but my attitude is 1,000 times better. I am happier than I have ever been, and it is a result of giving back to people and focusing on the positive things in my life." (Applause)

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome from Auburn University, the 2007 NCAA Inspiration Award winner, David Denniston.

Presenting David's award tonight is David Marsh, head swimming and diving coach at Auburn. (Applause)

RESPONSE—DAVID DENNISTON

Mr. Denniston: Thank you. I grew a moustache last week. I didn't grow it because I was trying to become a member of the Tom Selleck society or anything like that. I grew it because a friend of mine and I had made a

deal. Her goal was to stop cussing this year. It was a New Year's resolution. I said: "All right. I will grow a moustache until I hear you swear." She lasted a long time. I was starting to get pretty worried come Friday because I really didn't want to get up here with a really bad moustache. Truth be known, I have dated girls with a thicker moustache than I can ever grow. (Laughter)

While that was happening, I started thinking why do I do stupid things like this—like set up arrangements where I can embarrass myself in front of a group of people? The answer is simply the same reason that I have done a lot of things in my life—I want to see a friend become successful, and I will do whatever I can to make that friend successful. That is probably the only time in my life I am very thankful that she was not successful.

It was the same way growing up. I played football in junior high. At 145 pounds, I was probably the fiercest offensive tackle anyone has ever seen, because my best friend was the quarterback and I wasn't going to let anybody touch him. I don't think it is a coincidence that 12 years later that same friend is helping me off a mountain after I had broken my back.

I got a scholarship for swimming. When I chose to go to Auburn University, it was not because I wanted to be an NCAA champion for myself, it was because I wanted to be an NCAA champion with the team. I had that opportunity in 1999. Fortunately for me, in order for us to win in 1999, I was going to have to win individually.

It was the only national championship I won, but it was for a group of teammates I wanted to see be more successful than I wanted success for myself.

I know a lot of you guys don't watch swimming because it gets shown at 2 o'clock in the morning on ESPN11. But the most intense swimming event is the relays. Relays are such an awesome sporting event because you have three other guys behind the block that you are swimming for.

Every time I was at an NCAA competition, I didn't think about my individual races. I thought about the three other guys standing behind that block. I put every bit of energy that I could in those races for my teammates. It is no different now with the situation I am in.

With Project Walk, there is a group of people who are phenomenal athletes, and I want nothing more than to see them be successful. I had a friend who said: "Dave, you inspire all of us because you want to walk out of here with a bunch of people walking behind you." He almost had it right.

I want to walk out of there behind all of my friends walking ahead of me. So I will do everything I can to raise money with fund-raisers to support my friends to do that.

One of the individuals is a 12-year-old who at 19-months-old got run over by a car. He is learning to walk for the first time at 12 years old. He inspires me, not because of his work ethic, but because he plays basketball, rugby, goes surfing and running. He competes in every sport he can.

Another one of my good friends broke his neck jumping into a pool feet first. Somebody figure that out for me. I never have been able to. The doctors told him he would never use his arms again. Now he pushes himself around in a chair just like mine. These people inspire me, and that is something I try to give back to them because they are an inspiration to me.

When I was growing up, my mother's favorite saying in the world was: "No, but you can earn it." I wanted a lot of toys and a lot things growing up, but the response was: "No, but you can earn it." In that time, I have earned a scholarship, a degree, an NCAA championship, and with all due respect, this award. But I have not earned it yet.

By the way, my mom's first favorite phrase was: "I love you, 'Hugabuga'." I love you, too—both of you (parents). Thank you very much. (Applause)

With all due respect to the Honors Committee and everyone who nominated me for this award, I don't feel that I have earned the award, but I graciously accept it. But I want you to know my commitment to every one of you in this room and to my teammates in Project Walk, I will do everything I can to make sure that the people around me continue to be successful. I appreciate this very much. Thank you for this opportunity.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

2007 NCAA TOP VIII HONOREES

Mr. Ford: Our next group of honorees recently completed their eligibility as student-athletes, concluding stellar careers both on the playing field and in the classroom. Cooperation, you will see, is their strong suit. As student-athletes, they worked together with teammates to build successful programs. However, I think what sets the 2007 NCAA Top VIII honorees apart from their peers this year is their amazing achievements on the international stage—in the Olympics and in world competition—and their unique opportunities to impact young children by positive examples and strong leadership.

Some of them competed in two sports as a student-athlete. Several had outstanding performances in the Olympic Games and will represent their countries in future games.

They have spent countless hours volunteering for local groups in their communities, from promoting reading and physical fitness in healthy kids to planning special events for critically ill children.

Collectively, the 2007 NCAA Top VIII honorees will make their mark on our society. These men and women are indeed leaders. They have proven as much by leading their teams to championships and accomplishing individual greatness through their strong commitment, but they have also recognized that their skills would be called upon in the future, so they continue to pursue excellence whether by extending their studies, continuing their training, serving internships or joining the work force after graduation.

They will use their experiences as student-athletes and translate those lessons in the classroom into success as teachers, businessmen and women, and in one of our honoree's instances, as an astrophysicist.

At this time, I would like to introduce you to the 2007 NCAA Top VIII Award recipients.

Alison Crocker, Dartmouth College

As a skier and a rower, our first Top VIII recipient loves Mother Earth, but she spends most of her time looking at the stars.

Audiovisual: Few student-athletes have risen to and then maintained the level of excellence of Dartmouth College's Alison Crocker. A skier since a toddler, when Crocker arrived at Dartmouth College in 2002, she already was a competitive skier and a veteran of the rowing junior world championship circuit. She quickly made varsity on both Dartmouth teams and became a three-time first-team all-East skier.

On the slopes, Crocker was a three-time NCAA all-American and was the second-place finisher among Americans at the 2005 U.S. nationals.

Crocker's determination kept her at the top of her field in skiing and rowing, but it was her academic prowess that set her apart among her peers at Dartmouth. Crocker's work in the classroom is nothing short of remarkable. A double major in physics and mathematics, she counts being named a Rhodes scholar among her many academic achievements.

Graduating Phi Beta Kappa with a 3.98 grade-point average in 2006, she is working toward her doctorate degree in astrophysics at Oxford University, where she will focus on galactic evolution and dynamics.

As focused as Crocker is on studying the stars, it is her love for nature that has kept her busy as a member of a Dartmouth club for hiking, backpacking and trail maintenance. As part of the group, Crocker directed the maintenance for 72 miles of the Appalachian Trail. Whether on the field of play, in the community or in an astrophysics lab, Alison Crocker is a prime example of the student-athlete ideal.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, from Dartmouth College, Alison Crocker. Presenting Alison's award tonight is Cami Thompson, head women's Nordic skiing coach at Dartmouth. (Applause)

Laura Gerraughty, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

A wrist injury almost ended the career of our next Top VIII award winner, but perseverance and determination enabled her to come back from adversity, as you will see, in a big way.

Audiovisual: When Laura Gerraughty entered the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, in 2001, she immediately made her presence known, earning the No. 1 national ranking in the shot put. She would not relinquish that ranking throughout her entire collegiate career.

While she may have made it look easy, it was quite the contrary. During her career, Gerraughty was a 13-time ACC champion, a four-time NCAA champion, and in 2004 the first collegiate woman to win the U.S. Olympic

trial in shot put. But in 2005, she faced a major challenge.

Slowed by a wrist and hand injury, she sat out the season and scoured the country looking for a health professional who could help return her to championship form. After finding the right specialist, she did just that and in 2006 came back to win her fourth NCAA shot put championship.

Her academic strength may rival her physical gifts. Graduating with distinction in May of 2005, the biology major was awarded the ACC Weaver James Corigan Postgraduate Scholarship and garnered numerous other academic awards, including the UNC Patterson Medal, which recognizes one female and male student-athlete for their athletic accomplishments, leadership and sportsmanship.

In addition to her hard work in the classroom and in the arena, Gerraughty was a member of the UNC Student-Athlete Advisory Council and was a camp counselor and youth sports instructor. Gerraughty recently signed a contract to compete with Nike and has set her sights on the indoor world championships and the 2008 Olympic Games in Beijing.

As a person who believes that you get out what you put in, Laura Gerraughty is a shining example of the NCAA student-athlete. (Applause)

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Laura Gerraughty. Presenting Laura's award is Brian Blutreich, assistant track and field coach at North Carolina. (Applause)

Adrianne Musu Jackson-Buckner, State University College at Oneonta

The ability to be a positive role model has left an indelible image on our next Top VIII winner, a mentor and leader of tomorrow.

Audiovisual: For Adrianne Musu Jackson-Buckner, college was a learning experience in more ways than just in the classroom, where she excelled with a 3.8 grade-point average. She also found her true athletics calling in the spirit to give back to others.

Jackson-Buckner began college as a field hockey player, but when some teammates who also ran track encouraged her to try out for the team, she thought she would try it just for fun. That lark turned into an extraordinary collegiate track career where she became a two-time indoor track all-American, a four-time outdoor track all-American, and was named the 2006 Atlantic Region female track athlete of the year.

Her career highlight came at the national championship meet, where Jackson-Buckner, having already competed in the triple-jump, the 100 and the 4 X 100, was physically spent as she approached her final event, the 200 meters.

She confessed her concerns to her coach, who simply encouraged her to believe and run hard. That she did, and the former field hockey player won the NCAA Division III championship with a time of 23.75 seconds.

An English major with a love of Shakespeare, Jackson-Buckner became heavily involved in university and community activities as a coordinator for the Oneonta Safe Space Program and as a student diversity leader.

An active tutor and mentor for all other student-athletes, Adrianne Musu Jackson-Buckner operates by the guiding principle that when one is educated, it is then their duty to share that gift with others. She is now pursuing a master's degree in higher education, where she will continue to lead others, believe and run hard.

Mr. Ford: From the State University College at Oneonta, Adrianne Musu Jackson-Buckner. Presenting her the award is Dr. Barton Ingersoll, associate vice president for student development at Oneonta State. (Applause)

Ryan Koch, St. Cloud State University

Our fourth Top VIII recipient had a tough act to follow when his older brother recently won an NCAA post-graduate scholarship. Not surprisingly, though, this two-sport athlete didn't disappoint.

Audiovisual: Perfection—a goal that many strive for, but seldom achieve. Ryan Koch is the exception. Many student-athletes are judged solely by their performance as athletes, but for Koch, perfection was achieved as a student.

Majoring in computer science, Koch graduated with a perfect 4.0 GPA and was named five-time ESPN The Magazine academic first team all-American and four-time NCC academic all-American first team. Of course, he could more than hold his own as an athlete, too.

Enrolling at St. Cloud State University in 2001 on a partial football scholarship, Koch earned all-NCC football honors three times. He ranked second on St. Cloud State's all-time touchdown and reception list, tying the school record for receptions his senior year with 73.

As a walk-on to the track and field team, he would become one of its all-time great success stories. A three-time track and field all-American, Koch made four appearances in the NCAA Outdoor Track and Field Championships and placed second in the decathlon his senior year.

But during his senior year, Koch faced a major obstacle that would test his ability to focus in the classroom and on the field. Learning that his younger brother was diagnosed with cancer, Koch struggled with his priorities and was physically and mentally drained by the experience.

But with the spirit of a champion, he persevered. His brother went into remission, and Koch went on to win the St. Cloud State male athlete-of-the-year award in 2006, an NCAA postgraduate scholarship and the North Central Conference's student-athlete-of-the-year award.

Factor in Koch's community work with Kids Against Hunger, the Boys and Girls Club, and the Pediatric Unit at St. Cloud hospital, and Ryan Koch is a shining example of the power of athletic guts, classroom discipline and personal sacrifice.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, from St. Cloud State University, Ryan Koch. Presenting Ryan's award is Roy Saigo, president of St. Cloud State. (Applause)

Beth Mallory, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa

Coaches and teammates will tell you that our next Top VIII award winner focuses on what needs to be done today in order to achieve success tomorrow.

Audiovisual: For Beth Mallory, sports, family and a strong work ethic were constants while growing up in Ashland, Ohio. But when she became interested in the discus and hammer throw and there wasn't anyone around to coach her, her dad stepped in.

With no experience whatsoever, it was her dad's willingness to read up on coaching field events and Mallory's natural abilities and drive that earned her a scholarship to the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa.

At Alabama, she competed in the discus, shot put and hammer throw. While coaches there worked on her strength training and technique, her raw talent began to blossom. In Mallory's freshman year alone, she improved her personal best throw by 25 feet to 177 feet.

By her junior year, Mallory had achieved the sport's highest level, competing for the NCAA championship. There she unleashed a new personal record, 194-feet, 10-inches, to win the NCAA discus championship. She finished her career at Alabama as a four-time all-American in the discus and a two-time all-American in the hammer throw.

A physical education major with a 3.85 GPA, Mallory has a strong desire to help kids, especially through youth sports. She regularly volunteers in local schools and works as an advisor to other student-athletes. She is now a graduate student studying for her master's degree in K through 12 physical education.

She plans to teach after that, but not before chasing two special athletics goals. The first, helping her dad, the novice coach, who now competes himself in masters series discus events, and second, training for the 2008 Olympics, where Beth Mallory hopes to add an Olympic gold medal to her impressive list of accomplishments. (Applause)

Mr. Ford: From the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Beth Mallory. Presenting Beth's award tonight is Marie Robbins, senior woman administrator at Alabama. (Applause)

Heather O'Reilly, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Unfortunately, our next honoree could not be here due to a death in her family, but we would like to recognize her accomplishments this evening.

Following in the footsteps of past soccer greats, this Top VIII award recipient never flinched and has contributed yet another page to her school's championship tradition.

Audiovisual: When Heather O'Reilly began her soccer career at the University of North Carolina, Chapel

Hill, in 2003, she was coming off what had been a crippling setback. After breaking her leg while playing for the U.S. national team, O'Reilly returned only 10 days before the Tarheels' first game of the season. She went on to become the 2003 national freshman of the year, while helping the Tarheels to an undefeated season and a national championship.

In 2004, O'Reilly was a part of the U.S. Olympic team in Athens. In the semi-final round versus Germany, O'Reilly scored the game-winning, overtime goal over Germany on an assist from Mia Hamm. The team went on to win the gold medal.

The lure of one more year at North Carolina was so strong that she missed some of her national team events in order to finish her collegiate career. After leading the Tarheels in scoring her sophomore, junior and senior seasons, O'Reilly ended her career by leading North Carolina to yet another national championship in 2006.

In both her NCAA tournament appearances, she was named the Women's College Cup most valuable offensive player. She ranks third all time in goals scored in the NCAA tournament.

For O'Reilly, an education major, juggling the hectic schedule of collegiate competition, national team competition, and academics earned her ESPN The Magazine's scholar-athlete all-American of the year honors in 2005 and a spot on the Dean's List in both 2005 and 2006.

Off the field, O'Reilly has volunteered with various community service programs, including Adopt a Classroom, the Katrina Relief Fund and Carolina Dreams, which focuses on Carolina's continued growth in education, environmental and economical development. Heather O'Reilly's status as one of North Carolina's greatest women's soccer players is already cemented, but her best work off the field is yet to come.

Mr. Ford: In addition to our condolences, we send our congratulations to Heather and her family.

Katherine "Kat" Osterman, University of Texas at Austin

Our next Top VIII winner has had a busy summer and fall. After being named her sport's national player of the year, she helped the United States win a world championship in softball and earned a top seed in the 2008 Summer Olympics.

Audiovisual: From as early as she can remember, Katherine "Kat" Osterman has wanted to pitch. Her passion, work ethic and talent were evident even as a youth when she asked for pitching lessons on her 11th birthday.

As a freshman at the University of Texas at Austin in 2002, Osterman was an instant force on the softball field. Named the Big 12 freshman of the year and Big 12 pitcher of the year, Osterman's illustrious career began to move almost as quickly as her fastball.

As the only NCAA pitcher to register more than 2,000 strikeouts, Osterman's list of athletic achievements includes many collegiate national and international honors. In 2004, she led the U.S. national team to an Olympic gold medal and was recently selected No. 1 in two professional fast-pitch leagues.

Three is a charm for this three-time national collegiate player of the year, three-time Women's College World Series all-tournament selection, and three-time ESPY winner.

"Kat" Osterman now has a gold medal to add to her trophy case. Osterman's accomplishments are far from one dimensional. A psychology major, she boasts an extensive list of academic awards, including a two-time winner of the V.F. Doc Neuhaus Endowed Presidential Scholarship, Texas' highest honor recognizing outstanding academic and athletic achievement.

Osterman also gives back to communities by participating in programs like Neighborhood Longhorns and Marathon Kids. She plans to attend graduate school after competing in the 2008 Summer Olympics and one day hopes to lead her beloved Longhorns once again as a coach. A natural born leader, it is hard to imagine "Kat" Osterman not achieving anything that she puts her mind to.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, from the University of Texas at Austin, "Kat" Osterman. Presenting "Kat's" award will be Connie Clark, head softball coach at Texas. (Applause)

Our final Top VIII honoree is one of only two female gymnasts ever to compete at the Olympic Games as a collegiate athlete representing her native Canada and her NCAA institution as well.

Kate Richardson, University of California, Los Angeles

Audiovisual: Kate Richardson's ambitions have been apparent since childhood, when at the age of 10, she competed in her first national gymnastics championship. In 2000, she competed in the 2000 Summer Olympic Games in Sydney, Australia.

Finishing 15th overall, Richardson's was the highest finish ever for a Canadian in artistic gymnastics.

But she didn't stop there. Three years later, Richardson leaped to the college scene. She won NCAA individual championships in the floor exercise, balance beam and uneven bars, while leading her university to two NCAA team championships in her career. A three-time CoSida academic all-American and Pacific-10 academic honoree, Richardson was named the Pac-10 gymnast of the year as a senior.

During her career, she scored 10 perfect scores for her performances. As the first Canadian woman to qualify for an event final in the floor exercise in the Olympic Games, Richardson finished seventh in the 2004 Olympics.

In addition, she is one of only two female gymnasts ever to compete at the Olympic Games as a collegiate athlete.

An NCAA Woman of the Year honoree, Richardson's balance and versatility translated into the classroom. Majoring in psychobiology, she is an NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship winner.

Living the busy life of a student-athlete, Richardson still finds time to give back. Volunteering for Habitat for Humanity and participating on the Bruin Athletic Council, Kate Richardson exemplifies the life of a student-athlete and has earned the right to be called a champion.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, from the University of California, Los Angeles, Kate Richardson. Presenting Kate's award tonight is Petrina Long, assistant athletics director at UCLA.

I am going to join you folks for a few moments. Although our guests probably think they know a little bit about you, I think they would like to know a little bit more about you and to learn something about your experiences as a student-athlete and how they helped to contribute to your success.

Alison, let me start with you. A rower, a skier, a Rhodes scholar, I am sure there are young student-athletes out there saying I have a tough time getting through practice and getting my homework done. What sort of advice can you give somebody who says not only do I want to achieve, I want to enjoy the process of achieving?

Ms. Crocker: It comes down to selecting what you really like to do. I have absolutely loved skiing since I was very little, and I always have been interested in astronautic events, so it was selecting the right thing and then focusing on those.

Mr. Ford: So many times nowadays, especially for young people, we see that people are saying that you have to choose. You have to pick one or the other, you can't focus on one more than one thing that interests you. What do you say to that?

Ms. Crocker: You can certainly do it. It just takes scheduling the time that you do have in the proper way.

Mr. Ford: Laura, we oftentimes hear the expression that you don't really know what you have until you have lost it. We heard about that year of your wandering, trying to get that wrist injury healed. What did you learn about being an athlete and being a student during the year that you missed?

Ms. Gerraughty: Never give up. So many people around me were very supportive the whole time, but a lot of people said: "I guess your career is done. What are you going to do after school?" It stuck in my mind. It was just another bump in the road. I never stopped for a second to think I was done. I wasn't going to stop.

Mr. Ford: Did you find a greater sense of achievement and accomplishment when you were able to come back?

Ms. Gerraughty: Yes. My comeback from the injury was the NCAA indoors. I came in second. I heard that I must be so disappointed that I lost, but I thought I am here. I am second. That is nothing to sneeze at. I am back. I enjoyed every minute of it, and I was happy to live for that.

Mr. Ford: I am glad you came back. Kate, you are in a sport, perhaps more than any other sport, where you are striving for perfection. Some of the younger student-athletes out there might feel that in some way an absence of perfection is failure. What do you say to that?

Ms. Richardson: I think you have to love the sport and not be intrigued by the whole perfection thing. I just love skiing every day. I love flipping and flying. That is why I did it. Chasing a perfect 10 score was a challenge

for me and it was always an inspiration. You get closer and closer and you look toward that every day. You use that as motivation rather than success or failure.

Mr. Ford: Kat, you had a chance to participate on national teams, but you were one of the younger players. But as we all know, leadership can come from different places and different people. Did you find that your experiences as a collegiate athlete were able to help in some fashion assume the mantle of leadership on national teams?

Ms. Osterman: Yes. I was the youngest, and by no means a vocal leader. It came through experience at the University of Texas. I knew what it took to perform at that level. I just went back out and led by example. I know what kind of performance it takes. I knew that our team would come through. I just knew if I did my job confidently, they would follow.

Mr. Ford: Knowing that the national teams were composed of a number of other collegiate athletes who had excelled in softball, did you find that they had messages similar to yours based upon your experience as a student-athlete?

Ms. Osterman: Some of them were more vocal because they had been on the national team longer and were a little more experienced. But all of us went out there and tried to lead by example rather than being vocal to one another. We knew if one of us went out here and put on a great performance, you want to duplicate that and hold your own. We all want to go out there together. Any one of us could probably be tagged as a leader. But by being in that pitching circle, you often are looked upon to have a leadership role, but all of us go out and hold our own.

Mr. Ford: Musu, I know that diversity has been important to you as both a student and as an athlete. How do you think striving for and hopefully achieving diversity helps the performance of both a student and an athlete?

Ms. Jackson-Buckner: This year, I had a lot of opportunities to experience how diversity helps your performance. I learned that diversity is not just your skin color, your background or heritage. You play different sports or have a different major than somebody else. Diversity is more than one thing. I think working with your strength and your teammates' strengths, you are able to find what makes us different and how we can work together and help each other out. It turns into a mentor situation and you find how diversity among your teammates and other athletes can help to reach your goals.

Mr. Ford: Ryan, you were an accomplished football player and a decathlete. People realize as a decathlete you strive to be good in some events and maybe great in others. Talk with us about the message that comes from striving to be good in a lot of things and what that can say to student-athletes out there.

Mr. Koch: It was tough for me at times to think of myself as a decathlete. You are jack of all trades and master of none. I wanted to be the best in every event I participated in. That is the attitude I took in the classroom, on the football field and on the track. Whether it is a 100-yard sprint or the 1,500 at the end, it is tough at times to say that you want to try to be the best at everything when there is pressure to excel in one sport or one event. But I learned that playing football and being a decathlete is what life is all about. We all can strive to be well-rounded people. That is what we should strive to be, and the decathlon taught me that and prepared me for life.

Mr. Ford: Beth, we were talking a lot about experience and how it contributes to your success. In your sport, balance and power are essential. How does balance play a role in life as a student-athlete and all of the other different things that you have been able to accomplish?

Ms. Mallory: You have to set your priorities and you have got to work on what is most important to you. My school work has always been very important to me. I wanted to succeed in that area and make it to graduate school. That was my first priority, and my coach helped to support my studies. Track came next. If I had an obligation with school, that was my first priority. That was the most important thing.

Mr. Ford: Beth, you would like to teach and coach. How does being a leader as a student-athlete help you to be successful as a teacher and as a coach?

Ms. Mallory: The experience of being a student-athlete taught me that organizing your priorities is very important. The experiences I had through going to college will help me to teach how organization is important to students.

Mr. Ford: Musu, I am going to give you the last word. After what you have experienced over the years and

seen from your fellow recipients, what message would you pass on to young people?

Ms. Jackson-Buckner: I think we all have a niche. It takes work to find your niche. I think we all experience that. Once you find your niche, it is the best feeling in the world. You can excel and you feel full. If young athletes aspire to be in our position, they need to find their niche. That is the most important thing. Find what is best for you, what is important to you and be yourself.

Mr. Ford: I think each of you found your niche and managed to excel in them. Congratulations for being such role models for all of us.

NCAA 2007 AWARD OF VALOR

Ladies and gentlemen, our next award is the Award of Valor, which is presented to a current or former NCAA student-athlete in recognition of courageous action or bravery in situations involving personal danger or disaster.

As you will see, our Award of Valor honoree put others before himself in the service of our country.

Derek Hines, United States Military Academy

Audiovisual: When First Lieutenant Derek Hines finished his hockey career and graduated from the United States Military Academy in 2003, the next part of his life—service to his country—was about to begin. And he was ready for it. This, after all, was what he trained for at the Academy and in the Army Ranger School.

His tour of duty took him from the beautiful setting of Italy to the front lines of the battle on terrorism in Afghanistan. Questioning his own courage in journal entries, Hines routinely practiced boldness and firmness, as he put himself in harm's way to protect his unit time and time again.

Already a Silver Star and Purple Heart recipient and a soldier known for his brave acts, early in the morning of September 1, 2005, Hines led his troops on a mission to find the man responsible for bombing their convoy, a man suspected of being a Taliban leader.

Surrounding a hut in a rural Afghani village, Hines waited for his target. A few minutes later, they burst out of the hut, and started spraying machine-gun fire. Derek caught a round and lost his life at the age of 25.

It was in his passing that the world learned the unique traits he possessed—determination, perseverance and courage. They were traits that he learned from his family as well as on the ice as an NCAA student-athlete.

What you learn from athletics is lifelong—the commitment, the drive, the teamwork. How do you go through life not having that? At only 5-7 and 165 pounds, Hines' abilities on the ice were displayed through sheer heart and determination. He was small, but he played big and used his ever-present competitive streak to make everyone around him better.

As the Captain of the Army team, Hines quickly became a favorite of both fans and teammates for his gutsy style of play and leadership. Derek was a small guy, but he didn't think he was. He thought he was a big guy. He would go up against anyone.

His work ethic also extended into academics. He worked tirelessly in his classes and earned his degree in geography. He worked hard academically. It wasn't easy. There were many nights that he was up to 2 or 3 in the morning and the alarm would go off at 5, but he did it.

In the year that followed Hines' death, the imprint on those he touched was evident in many places. But it is the memories he created that will live in his family's hearts forever. He led from the front. That was his athleticism and that was upbringing in being a teammate. That comes from being an athlete and made him the type of leader that he was.

"Derek knew how much we loved him, and still love him. We just have to carry that hope that what you believe is true, and that we will all be together some day. We miss him so much." (Applause)

Mr. Ford: Representing the United States Military Academy and First Lieutenant Derek Hines is Derek's father, Steven. Presenting the Award of Valor tonight is Kevin Anderson, director of athletics at Army.

RESPONSE—MR. STEVEN HINES

Mr. Hines: Good evening. I would like to thank the NCAA and the NCAA Honors Committee for honoring Derek with the 2007 NCAA Award of Valor. I also want to thank Kevin Anderson and the West Point athletic department, Army hockey, coach Brian Riley, and retired coach Robb Riley for their continued support of Derek and our family.

I would also like to thank my family and friends who are here with us for this special occasion. In addition, I want to congratulate tonight's other award winners.

Of course, I wish I were not up here tonight accepting this award on behalf of my son. This is not how the Derek Hines' story was supposed to end, nor was it meant to end so soon. Unfortunately, we can't turn back the clock, but this Award of Valor will help to ensure that the legacy of Derek Hines will go on for many years.

Derek was never about Derek Hines the individual. When Derek was on a team, it was always about the team. Derek carried the lessons he learned through sports into commanding his soldiers. The lessons instilled by his coaches and fellow players showed Derek how to lead and also be led. It was through his experiences at West Point and on the Army hockey team that Derek developed into the leader he became.

Since Derek died, some of the soldiers who were in Afghanistan with him have visited with us. They told us about how he would always share his care packages that were sent to him. They spoke of a three-hour wiffle ball game with Afghani children that Derek started with the balls and bat he carried with him. How he would give up his bed at the safe house and sleep on the floor. How he would volunteer to go out on missions that he wasn't required to go on, once telling me, "Dad, I like the missions. I get bored when I am back on post."

Through all this, he never lost his sense of humor, wearing the headphones in the Humvee to his Ipod, but ready to jump into action when needed. He never complained, no matter how bad the warfare and conditions got.

Derek kept a war journal while in Afghanistan. Tonight, I would like to give you some insight on Derek's time at war by reading from it some of his more memorable entries:

"May 1, 2005. This might be one of the most exciting entries over the course of the next year. The past five days altered my life forever. As we were about to leave for Baylough for a Shurra, we picked up radio traffic saying the Taliban would attack the vehicle with machine guns and RPGs.

"So about one click down the road, the lead vehicle, with me in it, was hit. My first reaction was to exit the vehicle and return fire, but it was impossible to be effective with an M-4.

"After about 15 minutes of being buttoned down by the enemy, I jumped up on the 50-caliber and fired on the ridge line. It seemed like the only weapon that made the enemy put their heads down.

"I never thought it would happen to me, but the feeling of bullets whistling by my head definitely did in Afghanistan. So right now, I am torn about being ordered to put in paperwork for a Purple Heart. I was bleeding, but someone was shot, and I am getting the same award as him. It does not seem fair, but I guess that is the way the Army works.

"June 2, 2005. I am laying in my bed after just finishing 'American Soldier' and reflecting on my first two months in Afghanistan. I start out with a quote. General Tommy Frank's wrote in his epilogue. 'I hope America never forgets the power of will.'

"These soldiers I am serving with have some will and it has manifested itself daily. I hope that when I look back on this deployment a long time from now, I am happy that I went so hard. Finally, I am convinced I spend every day with some of the most professional and hardest working NCOs and soldiers in the Army. I could not ask for a better group of men that provide me inspiration on a daily basis.

"August 24, 2005. I just got back from a six-day patrol that changed my life forever. I saw things I never want to see again, but at the same time will never forget. On the convoy back from DeaChoppan, Lieutenant Highland's vehicle struck an IED that killed all but one instantly. SPC. Godoy was so lucky, though he still will take a long time to heal.

"As of right now I think his legs, pelvis and arm are all broken. I will always remember approaching him and seeing how distorted his body looked. I was so glad to hear he is going to be okay because he is such a good kid. Four lives ended but many more affected. They will be in my prayers for the weeks to come.

“The next day after the explosion, I attended my first ramp side ceremony and saw how powerful it was. It reminded me of a taps ceremony at West Point, done after a fellow cadet passes away. Again, something I will not forget. I am going to try and write more and more in case I am lost. This book can tell people the work I have done.”

Lieutenant Derek Hines fought for a cause, which he truly believed in, freedom. We, as Americans, sometimes have taken this freedom for granted because it is a liberty we have enjoyed all our lives. But this freedom is possible because of the sacrifices made by the men and women in all branches of the military.

Derek fought gallantly to protect and preserve our freedom and our way of life. Derek not only made the ultimate sacrifice for the United States and the people of Afghanistan, but he made it for his teammates and the soldiers to his left and to his right who depended on him every day. Derek led the way in protecting them all while bringing the fight to the enemy.

In closing, I again will quote from Derek’s War Journal:

“April 25. On the issue of courage, I do not know if this quality exists in me, but I hope when the time comes I will respond. My mind and body want this to happen soon just to get it under my belt.”

There is no doubt that Derek Hines had courage. He is a true American hero.

Words cannot express our loss and grief, though your acknowledgement of Derek’s sacrifice continues to lift our spirits and will allow the legacy of Derek Hines to live on forever. We are truly honored by your recognition of Derek’s sacrifice. We sincerely thank you.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

NCAA SILVER ANNIVERSARY AWARD WINNERS

Mr. Ford: Our next group of honorees graduated in 1982, the same year that “Chariots of Fire” won the Oscar for the best picture and “Bette Davis Eyes” was the No. 1 single. It seems like only yesterday doesn’t it? That same year, Yale University announced it was offering a 14-week class on mastering the Rubik’s Cube, which makes me and the other three Ivy League Silver Anniversary Winners proud.

Twenty-five years ago, these men and women participated in football, basketball and volleyball, as well as swimming, gymnastics, and track and field. In the last 25 years, they have moved on to lead businesses in health care, insurance and construction. One is an educational entrepreneur. One is an orthopedic surgeon. One gives back to the sport in which he competed by working for the national governing body. They were strong leaders as student-athletes. They are leaders in their respective fields today and by their guidance and example, they will groom and mentor tomorrow’s leaders as well.

Though 25 years separates the dates on their diplomas, the 2007 Silver Anniversary class shares some similar experiences as student-athletes with the NCAA Top VIII. The uniforms and hairstyles may have changed, but the intensity and commitment did not. The struggles and the lessons learned through competition in the classroom and on the playing fields are the same. The determination and strength remain the same now as they use their talents in the real world and in their communities.

Gail Koziaro-Boudreaux, Dartmouth College

Our first Silver Anniversary Award recipient was a three-time Ivy League basketball player of the year and an all-American shot putter. As an executive vice-president of the nation’s fourth largest health insurer, she has cemented her status as one of Chicago’s most influential women.

Audiovisual: With Title IX only in its infancy and women’s athletics grossly under-funded, the multi-talented Gail Koziaro-Boudreaux made the most of her athletics and academic experience by attending the Ivy League’s Dartmouth College. As a psychology major and a two-sport student-athlete, Koziaro handled the workload flawlessly, excelling in track and field and basketball.

As a shot putter, she was an all-American as a junior and senior. As a basketball player, she was a three-time Ivy League player of the year, leading her team to three conference championships.

A Wade Trophy finalist, Boudreaux averaged a double-double for her career and led the NCAA in rebound-

ing as a sophomore. She still holds the Dartmouth record for career points and rebounds.

Now a married mother of two, Boudreaux is a continued success story. She is executive vice-president for Health Care Service Corporation, the nation's fourth largest health insurer. She remains active in the Dartmouth Alumni Council and is a member of the Chicago Network, an organization of Chicago's most influential women.

In 2003, Gail Koziaro-Boudreaux was inducted into the New England Basketball Hall of Fame, and for this mother, wife, mentor and businesswoman, nothing is out of reach.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, from Dartmouth College, Gail Koziaro-Boudreaux. Presenting Gail's award is Chris Wielgus, head women's basketball coach at Dartmouth.

Rowdy Gaines, Auburn University

Our next honoree has more than lived up to his nickname, his friends will tell you. As an Olympic gold medal winner and NCAA champion, he made some waves in the swimming community and proved that a serious illness could not keep him from the sport he loved.

Audiovisual: He has been called swimming's ambassador to the world. Already a swimming champion before the age of 10, Rowdy Gaines was a multisport athlete before settling in the pool, becoming an eight-time NCAA champion and six-time SEC individual champion at Auburn University.

As a speech communications major, Gaines collected 22 all-American honors, was the 1981 SEC athlete of the year, and in 1982 was awarded the McDonald's Spirit Award, one of swimming's highest honors.

He set two world records in the 100- and 200-meter freestyle events. After winning five gold medals at the 1979 Pan Am Games, Gaines was a member of the 1980 Olympic team that boycotted the Moscow Games.

Coming back in the 1984 Olympics in Los Angeles, Gaines won three gold medals, but his fast-moving career came to a halt.

In August of 1991, Gaines faced a monumental hurdle. Diagnosed with Guillian-Barre Syndrome, a disorder that attacks the peripheral nervous system, Gaines was temporarily paralyzed. Rebounding quickly, just one year later after making a full recovery, Gaines won two master's championships, and at the age of 35 became the oldest swimmer to qualify for the 1996 Olympic trials.

Known as the voice of swimming, Gaines has also enjoyed a successful career as a television commentator and for the fifth time in his broadcasting career, he will cover swimming at the 2008 Olympic Games in Beijing.

Today, Gaines continues to embody the spirit of an NCAA student-athlete, still heavily involved in the world of swimming. He serves as the chief fund-raising and alumni officer for USA Swimming and as a spokesperson for several organizations, including the Children's Miracle Network and Swim Across America, an organization that is helping to find a cure for cancer. (Applause)

Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome from Auburn University, Rowdy Gaines. Presenting Rowdy's award tonight is David Marsh, head swimming and diving coach at Auburn. (Applause)

Steve Jordan, Brown University

As a standout Ivy League receiver and an all-Pro tight end for the Minnesota Vikings, our next honoree tore it up on the football field. But in his community, he proves to be quite the teddy bear, lending his time, talent and leadership to numerous youth organizations and foundations.

Audiovisual: Steve Jordan's story is one of perseverance. Starting school a year early, it wasn't until his junior year of high school that his physical abilities caught up with his intellect, enabling him to play football at Brown University.

Settling into the college lifestyle, Jordan began to find himself on the football field. As the school's leading tight end, Jordan broke the single-game receiving record with 188 yards against Penn State in 1981.

He went on to set the single-season record for receiving the same year and was a two-time all-Ivy League player. He finished his career as Brown's third-leading career receiver. Jordan was equally impressive off the field, juggling the rigorous schedule of an engineering student.

A member of the Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity and the National Society of Black Engineers, Jordan did not simply adapt to being a student-athlete, he excelled.

In 1982, Jordan moved on to an even more rigorous challenge, the NFL. Drafted by the Minnesota Vikings, Jordan went on to play 13 seasons as a pro, making six Pro Bowl appearances and assuming a leadership position as the Vikings' player union representative.

After football, Jordan put his engineering degree to good use, working as director of construction services for Ryan Companies, Inc., a multi-million dollar company with more than 300 employees.

This proud father of three has served on the boards of the College Football Hall of Fame and the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation and in volunteer positions for the Special Olympics, the Multiple Sclerosis Society and the National Missing Children's Foundation

In what may be the ultimate example of his dedication, Jordan established the Steve R. Jordan Endowment Scholarship for Minority Athletes in 2002, enabling future Brown student-athletes to follow in his footsteps.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, from Brown University, Steven Jordan. Presenting Steven's award tonight is Michael Goldberger, director of athletics at Brown.

Patricia Melton, Yale University

As a standout track student-athlete at Yale, our next honoree was successful in the hurdles. After losing her mother at a young age, she has not let life's hurdles stop her from achieving her dream. In her career as a school developer, she has proven that no hurdle is too high as she strives for educational equity for all children.

Audiovisual: It is hard to imagine making a life-altering decision as a child, but that is precisely what Patricia Melton was faced with at the young age of 12. After losing her mother, Melton felt that she had to take control of her life.

"I decided that I really have to take my life into my own hands and determine my destiny. And it was probably more out of fear than anything else."

Securing a scholarship and enrolling herself into an East Coast boarding school, it wasn't until her arrival at Yale in 1977 as a lacrosse student-athlete that Melton discovered her true talent for running and, as a student majoring in Afro-American studies, her desire was to improve education.

With blazing speed and that same raw determination she used as a child, Melton raced into Yale University's record books, setting records that still stand in both the indoor 400-meter dash and the outdoor 400-meter hurdles. As a captain and all-American hurdler for the 1982 Yale track team, Melton, a U.S. Marine Corps reservist in college, was selected as the Ivy League athlete of the year. She also won her university's Nellie Elliott Award, recognizing her as the school's most outstanding student-athlete.

As a Yale-educated school developer and education consultant, Melton is now living out her dream of helping others. Instrumental in the start up of nine schools in several states, Melton regularly travels the country working with communities to design and start small innovative schools.

"I look at myself and I say that without education I wouldn't be the person I am today. This award is a validation and affirmation of how important education is, how important athletics are as a tool to really develop people. It gives me that much more passion to make that much more of a difference with the communities that I work with."

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome from Yale University, Patricia Melton. Presenting her award tonight is Mark Young, previously her coach and current director of cross country and track and field at Yale. (Applause)

Ann Woods-Smith, University of Florida

A Broderick Award winner as a gymnast, this Silver Anniversary recipient began her career in public relations early with her participation in Florida's student chapter of the Public Relations Society of America and has since worked with some of the most recognizable brands in our country.

Audiovisual: When Ann Woods-Smith entered Clarion State in 1979, success came quickly for the gymnast. After competing in the World University Games that year, she followed her coach to the University of Florida.

Although she adjusted seamlessly to the transfer, Woods quickly found a groove as a 1981 and 1982 all-Southeastern Conference team member. Her senior year in 1982 was a transcendent year in which she split time

between AIAW and NCAA competition, winning the AIAW all-around, uneven bars and floor exercise championships, and finishing third in the vault at the NCAA championships.

For her exceptional efforts, she won the Broderick Award recognizing her as the top collegiate gymnast. A 12-time all-American, Woods is still ranked third on the Gators' all-time list with 20 all-around individual victories.

A public relations major, Woods' intense focus on academics earned her an NCAA postgraduate scholarship in 1982. In graduate school, she served an internship as the women's sports information director. With the experience she gained in college as a member of a student public relations society and that of her graduate internship in athletics media relations, Woods soon turned her focus to the international stage, helping to promote the first ever Goodwill Games.

Currently, Ann Woods-Smith is senior director of public affairs for Medco Health Solutions, Inc., a Fortune 500 company. Dividing her time between family and charitable causes, this married mother of two is involved with the Boys and Girls Club of America and the Make-A-Wish Foundation.

She continues to support her alma mater as a member of the University of Florida alumni association and the University of Florida letterman's clubs, making her a true role model to all.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, from the University of Florida, Ann Woods-Smith. Presenting Ann's award is Dr. Ruth Alexander, former women's athletics administrator at Florida. (Applause)

William B. Stetson, University of Southern California

Our final Silver Anniversary Award winner may be the only orthopedic surgeon to have graduated with a degree in classical civilization. An NCAA volleyball champion at USC, he has remained active in sports through his medical career and recently started a nonprofit organization that will improve health care in third-world countries.

Audiovisual: For Dr. William B. Stetson, the concept of hard work came naturally. Earning an athletics scholarship to the University of Southern California in 1978, Stetson became one of the most successful volleyball players in USC history.

As a four-year letterman and team captain, Stetson led the Trojans to the NCAA tournament every year, including a national championship run in 1980. For all of his success on the court, it could be said that Stetson's greatest achievements as a student-athlete were in the classroom.

Graduating cum laude, Stetson was a dean's list student and was honored as USC's most outstanding senior student-athlete in 1982 and the Pacific-10 Conference most outstanding scholar-athlete of the year as well.

Entering medical school in 1984, Stetson continued his volleyball career. As he studied to become a surgeon, he became an international champion, competing on the professional volleyball circuit.

Now an orthopedic surgeon, Stetson is still winning. In 2006, he was recognized as a top physician and surgeon nationally.

But for all of his achievements, it is his desire to give back that makes Stetson an example to all. Making regular visits to Cuba and other countries in need on medical missionary trips, he is a leader in educating fellow doctors on improved orthopedic surgery methods.

"There were many surprises when I came to Cuba. I was so taken aback by the zest they have for life. I really fell in love with them and really committed myself to doing something to help them."

Whether serving on the court or serving mankind, Dr. Bill Stetson embodies the true spirit of the NCAA student-athlete.

Mr. Ford: Please welcome from the University of Southern California, Dr. Bill Stetson. Presenting Bill's award is Dr. Brandon Martin, associate athletics director at Southern California.

Congratulations to all of you. We had a chance to talk with our Top VIII recipients to get their thoughts on what helped them as student-athletes. You have now had 25 years to think back on your experience. I want to talk to you a little bit about how your experience contributed to your success.

Rowdy, I will start with you. I think it is fascinating that you have become known as the grand ambassador for the sport of swimming. Why such a passion and how has it carried over through these 25 years for you?

Mr. Gaines: The sport has given me so much, Jack. When we talk about words like perseverance, dedication and commitment, I have learned so much at Auburn. I really grew from a boy to a man there, and it was a life-changing experience. All those different aspects I learned in college really carried on over into my life.

I always like to say my life is a piece of cake compared to college life and the dedication and commitment that you needed to have then. During this last 25 years, I have learned a lot about myself. I have learned to put my life into perspective and how important health is to you and how important family and friends are. That is what means so much to me now.

Mr. Ford: Steve, young people might find Brown University, engineering and the NFL as an unusual combination in this day and age. What sort of message can you send to them about those types of aspirations and why they shouldn't find them unusual?

Mr. Jordan: In my situation, as was mentioned earlier, it's a matter of finding your niche. When I came to Brown, I found my niche. I knew I wanted to be an engineer, but even though I was a late bloomer on the field, I really had a passion for football. So that started to work out for me.

Community service was something that was instilled in us by our parents. It says in the Bible to those who give a lot, a lot is expected. You have the guiding principles, and you just go through life like that. It becomes second nature to you.

Mr. Ford: Pat, why education? Why so early in your life did you say this is my mission, this is important to me?

Ms. Melton: My mother instilled this in me. My mother did not finish her high school education. She really started her family very young, which was not unusual back in her day. She instilled in us that education was very important and I found that education was an avenue.

Education can change people's lives. I am very passionate about education. It really touches people and it changes communities and draws people in.

Mr. Ford: Gail, when you were at Dartmouth, it was in the early days of Ivy League women's athletics. You were pioneers in some fashion. You were juggling two sports. As you look at your life now, as you juggle your roles as a wife, mother and business executive, what did you learn from your juggling as a student-athlete that carries over to what you do now?

Ms. Boudreaux: I think sports instill dedication, organization and focus. Looking back at my college days, it was an opportunity to be a student and train for my sports. I have taken the experiences from those opportunities to my business career and it's helped me to manage and juggle my family life and my work in the community. Taking advantage of your opportunities is critical. It is a skill that I speak about a lot at work. The foundation you get in team sports is one of the best things for students to build on as they go through life. I highly encourage it.

Mr. Ford: As the older Silver Anniversary Award recipients oftentimes joke, when the Top VIII comes along, it makes us feel significantly older. I have got to tell you that Ann was a high school student in the school where my wife taught when we thought we were old then. You can imagine what Ann's presence here suggests to us.

It certainly is a delight to see you here. As you mentioned, you knew early on what you wanted to do with your life. Public relations was important to you. Messages and communications are important. I think one of the difficulties in this day and age is that the general public doesn't understand how hard student-athletes have to work to be good at being students and good at being athletes. How do you think we can better communicate that message?

Ms. Woods-Smith: I believe the way to communicate is through setting examples for them and helping them to understand that there is really a support system there for them to do both and let them know that if you work really hard, if you set goals, and you really set your mind toward achieving those goals, you can do it all. You can have it all. But it is up to the individual to put forth the effort.

As far as communicating this, I think we do it every day by showing by example exactly what it takes to get there and then giving them the support and the tools to achieve their goals.

Mr. Ford: Bill, you can tell you're an orthopedic surgeon when you're surrounded by a room full of former athletes, because they're lined up to ask you questions about their various injuries and maladies 25 and more years later.

Can you talk in terms of your experiences as a championship volleyball student-athlete and the parallel of your experience as an orthopedic surgeon?

Mr. Stetson: I had a passion when I was growing up for athletics. It helped me in achieving the goals I had in winning a national championship. I carried that passion on to medicine. I have a passion to care for people and to help others. I have to thank my parents for that. It was instilled in me at an early age from my father, who was a family physician. My parents are wonderful people.

Mr. Ford: We talked before about the fact that here you were an all-American on championship teams, went on to become an orthopedic surgeon and majored in classical civilization. That raises an interesting issue. I am asking for a bit of advice here. What would you suggest to current and younger student-athletes to position themselves where they can excel as athletes and also experience all that their institutions have to offer as students?

Mr. Stetson: I always knew I wanted to be a physician, but I didn't want to take the traditional route because I knew there was more out there than just studying the biology of a frog. I really wanted to get a well-rounded background, so I chose classical civilization. I studied Latin in high school and I studied Latin in college. Greek and Roman civilizations were just fascinating.

Mr. Ford: Steve, how do you think the athletes of today differ from the athletes of 25 years ago?

Mr. Jordan: I think the demands are more intense. I have got three children at the college and high school levels. I stay involved with youth quite a bit. The demand is just a lot more intense. Sports certainly have gone to a higher level of participation.

All of the technology we now have is a wonderful thing. There is more information out there than when we were student-athletes. In a nutshell, I would say the intensity of being a student-athlete today is a lot more than it was back in my day.

Mr. Ford: Considering that intensity, if a young woman came to you and said I just got accepted to Yale and I think I would like to engage in sports, but I am just worried that I wouldn't have the time to be good as a student and as an athlete. What sort of advice would you give her?

Ms. Melton: My advice would be to just put your all into it and know that the institution is here to support you. You will be able to achieve your goals. If you have faith and put your best foot forward, your passion will carry you through the day.

Mr. Ford: Rowdy, I will give you the last word here. With the clarity 25 years brings, as we look back on your experience as a student-athlete and what you have all accomplished over those 25 years, what sort of message do you think there is for student-athletes of today?

Mr. Gaines: Fortunately, when you are in the university situation, you get a feeling of love and respect for your teammates. These are your brothers and sisters that you live with on a daily basis. When I was in school, we weren't really part of a fraternity. Our fraternity was our team.

So many people think of my sport as an individual sport, but in so many ways it is team support. That is something you should relish and just remember every single day of your life, because those come flooding back to me every time I see a team play and look at Auburn and their swimming team go to greatness. The guy who gave me my award tonight, David Marsh, is a friend of mine. He was a teammate of mine, and he coached me at one time. Those memories I will never forget.

Mr. Ford: Well, I think each of you in your lives has provided not only great memories but great messages for all of us. Just as the Top VIII members have been role models for young people, you have all been wonderful role models for all of them, too. I want to thank you all again and congratulate you on your magnificent achievements.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

THEODORE ROOSEVELT AWARD

Our final award of the evening is the NCAA Theodore Roosevelt Award, affectionately known as the Teddy, the highest honor bestowed by the NCAA upon a former varsity student-athlete. Strength and resolve have been characteristics of former Teddy winners, often shown in their accomplishments long after their NCAA student-athlete experience has ended.

This year's Teddy Award winner played basketball in college before leading one of the world's most recognizable franchises. During a 16-year stint as commissioner of the National Football League, he supervised league expansion and negotiated labor agreements and the largest-ever television contract.

The former Georgetown team captain was instrumental in introducing the NFL to overseas markets and recently oversaw the launch of the NFL network.

Our Teddy Award recipient has put to work the lessons learned as an NCAA student-athlete while leading the world's most powerful entertainment franchise.

Audiovisual: Paul Tagliabue, well-known as commissioner of the NFL and a master strategist, is the architect of pro football's rise to its status as America's most popular sport. But few would guess that this same Paul Tagliabue could go toe-to-toe with basketball greats like Alonzo Mourning and Dikembe Mutumbo and more than hold his own.

As a three-year starter for Georgetown University's basketball team, Tagliabue was a rebounding machine. He ranks ninth on the school's all-time average rebound list, higher than either Mourning or Mutumbo.

But it wasn't only his athletic skill that set Tagliabue apart; he was a leader. As president of his senior class, Tagliabue became a Rhode's scholar finalist and started to take a more serious interest in life beyond basketball.

In 1965, he entered the New York University School of Law on a full scholarship. The same fierce energy that drove his rebounding greatness fueled his intellectual pursuits.

After completing law school, Tagliabue took a job at the Pentagon working for the U.S. Secretary of Defense as a policy analyst. His insight and dedication won him the Meritorious Service Medal, the Defense Department's highest award.

In 1969, Tagliabue left government work and accepted a position as an attorney, serving as part of the NFL's outside counsel.

The league had just acquired its rival, the AFL, and Tagliabue's behind-the-scenes work on the merger and on growing the league's reach via television were instrumental in pro football's continued success.

Ultimately, he would join the league and be prepped for its top position. In 1989, Tagliabue became commissioner of the NFL. His leadership enabled the NFL to address key priorities.

Among them, expansion from 28 to 32 teams; negotiating successful long-term labor agreements; and securing the largest television contracts in entertainment history. Becoming the NFL's most powerful man didn't stop Tagliabue from giving back.

Serving on the Board of Governors for the United Way and even chairing it in 1998 and 1999, his generous efforts have reached out to many communities and organizations. For his gracious acts, leadership and academic excellence, Paul Tagliabue personifies the NCAA student-athlete and serves as a model for success.

Mr. Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome the 2007 NCAA Theodore Roosevelt Award winner, from Georgetown University, Paul Tagliabue. (Applause)

Presenting Paul's award tonight is NCAA President Myles Brand.

RESPONSE—PAUL TAGLIABUE

Mr. Tagliabue: This has really been a wonderful evening of memories, of inspirations, of good conversation about the past, the present and the future of intercollegiate athletics, and especially of student-athlete leaders.

My deep thanks go to all those responsible for making this such a memorable evening. It is really a special honor for me to be honored by the NCAA through the Teddy Award.

I must say I am particularly pleased to be joining the other honorees this evening. David Denniston and Derek Hines have given us uncommon examples of inspiration, bravery and courage. To them, we are indebted for some of the most cherished and important aspects of our society. First of all, hope, and second, as Derek's father so eloquently stated, our freedom. To them, I thank them from the bottom of my heart and I know you do the same.

All of the veteran Silver Anniversary honorees and also the current student-athletes who are Top VIII honorees have excelled not just in athletics, as we have seen, and not just in academics, but also in community service. As I listened to them and saw what they are doing, I must say that as proud as I am to receive this award for

myself tonight, as an aging fossil, I am even prouder to get to know them and see them. I have more confidence than ever about the future of our nation knowing that it is in the hands of the young men and women we saw here tonight.

My special thanks go to my good friend, Jack DeGioia, the president of Georgetown University, for recommending me for the Teddy.

I arrived at Georgetown in 1958 on a basketball scholarship. I came from Jersey City, the first ever to go to college in my family.

Some of my friends say I have not traveled very far since I left Georgetown over four decades ago, all the way from the basketball court to the football field. My four years at Georgetown began a process of personal transformation and gave me a foundation of very special values that have enriched my life ever since.

When I arrived at Georgetown, I was really excited about both my academic and my basketball prospects. I threw myself into both. But I quickly found that dealing with both taught me some important, sometimes painful lessons.

First, adulthood growing up inevitably requires making choices and setting priorities. Dealing with adversity requires one to adapt quickly and to learn to expect adversity. Further, we should not only expect adversity but we should know that we need to commit and recommit our talents to explore new opportunities when we face adversity.

By my junior year, my love for basketball was losing out to my love for the library and academic competition. I had some wonderful faculty and some wonderful mentors at Georgetown. By my senior year, my most memorable basketball game was in Madison Square Garden, but it was memorable for a different reason than you might expect. I missed the game because I was at a Rhode's scholar final competition.

I think the Washington Star wrote a headline saying because I wasn't there Georgetown won. I didn't win the Rhodes, but they did win the game. I did end up with a full academic scholarship, a special program at New York University Law School dedicated to public service.

Since graduating from Georgetown, I have been very fortunate to have a number of very rewarding careers as a lawyer, in academia as a professor, as a business executive, and in government. I want to thank everybody that I have ever worked with for helping me.

After 37 years with the NFL, being honored tonight for having the qualities or sharing the ideals and purposes of Teddy Roosevelt, is a very unusual link back to my early days for me with the NFL.

In the early '70s when I was first beginning to work as a young attorney on NFL matters, the then commissioner Pete Rozelle asked me to go to Dallas to talk with Tex Schramm, the legendary president and leader of the Dallas Cowboys, and the creator of what Tex called America's team. Many of you knew him. As a young attorney, I was to discuss with Tex Schramm the rationale for the college player draft, which was being challenged in court. We had a long and sometime contentious meeting the first time I had met Tex.

As I was leaving, he pulled me aside and he said, "You are new to this business and you won't survive long if you don't know what Teddy Roosevelt said about how to conduct your life." As I said, the meeting was a little contentious, and I was a little feisty.

I said, "Well, Teddy Roosevelt said a lot of things. What are you referring to?" He picked up from his desk a framed quotation from T.R. and started to read: "The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood, who strives valiantly, who errs and comes up short again and again."

He then put his forefinger in my chest, which he did many, many times in future years, to emphasize his point. He said, "You will never be a success unless you are a person like Teddy Roosevelt." Then he continued to read, "A person, who if he fails, at least he fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who knew neither victory nor defeat."

At that point, I guess I knew I was being told that I had been cold and timid, at least by Tex's standards.

"Put that in your briefcase; take it home and study it, and if we ever meet again, I'll be able to find out whether you have taken it to heart."

That was a great opening meeting.

Receiving tonight's award is not just an honor for me, it would undoubtedly make Tex Schramm very happy because it seems to confirm that I took T.R.'s advice to heart.

That's enough of my reflections on my almost 50 years in intercollegiate and professional sports.

I just want to say a couple of words about the future. As we look ahead at the future of intercollegiate sports, we can all see a rich blend of continuity and tradition. We can see tremendous change. We can see lots of innovations in many, many areas, including technological innovations and demographic change.

But as I look ahead in the coming decades in intercollegiate sports, I am confident that the critical core values and ideals will continue to be honored. That includes amateurism, academic performance and sportsmanship. I am also confident that there will be continued advances in access to the intercollegiate experience, in diversity and in the equitable participation of men and women alike in all sports. That, I think, is the future that we can all proudly strive to secure.

As a member of Georgetown's Board of Trustees, I can assure you that I will be working hard to try to secure that future.

Thank you very, very much for recognizing me as you have done tonight. I appreciate it very much.

It is now my honor to present to Georgetown's President, Jack DeGioia, the NCAA Theodore Roosevelt Institution Award. Thank you, Jack.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

Mr. Ford: Our congratulations once again to all of our award winners tonight. Your stories have shown us how true leadership is defined, the kind of determination and strength it takes to make a good leader, and how your efforts and talents as NCAA student-athletes have lasting implications on our world. I am sure I speak for everyone here tonight when I say that you have our appreciation and gratitude for your commitment and for your achievements.

That wraps up tonight's events. Thank you all for joining us for the 2007 NCAA Honors Celebration. It has been indeed a special evening. Goodnight to all of you.

[The Honors Celebration concluded at 9 p.m.]

DIVISION I BUSINESS SESSION

SATURDAY, JANUARY 6, 2007

The Division I business session was called to order at 2:30 p.m. by Division I Board of Directors Chair Philip Austin, president of the University of Connecticut.

OPENING REMARKS

Philip Austin (University of Connecticut): Welcome, ladies and gentlemen. I am Phil Austin. I am the president of the University of Connecticut. I have served the last couple of years as chair of the Division I Board of Directors. I am joined on the platform by Kate Hickey, the associate AD at Rutgers, and chair of the Division I Management Council; Jackie Campbell, associate commissioner of the Atlantic-10 Conference and vice chair of the Management Council.

In addition, we have David Berst, Beth DeBauche, Steve Mallonee and Lynn Holzman from the NCAA staff.
[Note: Electronic voting procedures were reviewed.]

This is the only business session for Division I. A motion to reconsider a prior vote has to be made before the conclusion of this session and has to be made by a delegate who was on the prevailing side of the vote to be addressed.

The process we will use to consider Proposal Nos. 2005-54 and 2005-128 can be found on Pages 1 through 5 of the 2007 Division I Official Notice.

I will open discussion of the motion to over-ride the Board of Directors' April 2006 action to adopt the proposal and will call on those who wish to speak to approach a microphone. Once the chair is satisfied that the discussion has concluded or that no new information concerning the matter at issue is being presented, I will announce that it is time to vote.

Please remember that a "yes" vote will support the motion to over-ride the Board, with the understanding that if the over-ride is successful for legislation now in effect, graduate transfers will be able to use the provisions of 2005-54 for eligibility at a new institution during enrollment in the remainder of the 2006-07 academic year.

A "no" vote would defeat the over-ride and will support the Board of Directors' action to adopt 2005-54. Abstentions count in the determination of a quorum, but not in the determination of a majority vote.

A successful over-ride of the Board of Directors, therefore, requires a five-eighths majority of "yes" votes over the total "yes" and "no" votes cast on the motion. Five-eighths is 62.5 percent. In addition, all Division I voting members are eligible to cast a vote on Proposal 2005-54.

Once we have completed the consideration on the over-ride motion concerning 2005-54, we will use the same process to consider the motion to over-ride the Board's action to defeat 2005-128. Active members and conferences in the NCAA Football Championship Subdivision of Division I, formerly I-AA institutions and conferences, may vote on this football-related proposal. I hope this information is helpful in conducting an orderly business session.

Are there any questions that the real experts here or I can address? Very good.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS

I now call the 2007 Division I business session to order. First, we will consider an over-ride of the Board of Directors' action to adopt Proposal No. 2005-54, which now permits a student-athlete who is enrolled in a specific graduate degree program at an institution other than where he or she received a baccalaureate degree to participate in intercollegiate athletics regardless of any previous transfers.

ELIGIBILITY—GRADUATE STUDENT OR POSTBACCALAUREATE PARTICIPATION— TRANSFER ELIGIBILITY

Barbara Church (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): I move to over-ride the Board's adoption of Proposal 2005-54.

[The motion was seconded.]

Patrick Henry (Siena College): I represent the student-athletes of the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference.

Katie Street (Boise State University): I represent the student-athletes of the Western Athletic Conference. Both Patrick and I are members of the Division I NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC).

Division I student-athletes adamantly oppose the over-ride of Proposal 2005-54. Current legislation aims to provide graduating student-athletes with eligibility remaining to continue their education in a graduate program that best fits their needs to enhance their career outside of sports.

Please give the student-athletes the credit to make this important decision for themselves. We know that concerns have been raised in the membership that this legislation will increase transfer rates in massive numbers. However, it is critical to recognize that this has actually been used on a very limited basis. According to recent data, of the 5,000 or so student-athletes who graduated last year with eligibility remaining, only 112 chose to pursue graduate programs at other institutions.

Mr. Henry: By graduating, these student-athletes are fulfilling one of the major goals and aims of the NCAA and its respective member institutions. The Association has consistently emphasized the importance of graduation rates and aspiring students first and athletes second.

Dr. Brand recently wrote, "Athletics can and does teach the knowledge and skills that develop young people into productive citizens in a wide range of careers beyond sports."

"Very few student-athletes become professional athletes. Many more become doctors, lawyers, engineers and teachers."

In the context of Dr. Brand's comments, the current rule emphasizes the importance of being a student and allows those student-athletes who have fulfilled all of their academic duties, requirements and responsibilities at their respective undergraduate institution, the ability to incorporate athletics into their future academic pursuits.

The NCAA should encourage these students' pursuits as we attempt to advance in our careers and become pro in something other than sports. If the proposal is over-ridden, graduating students with eligibility remaining who do not qualify for the one-time transfer exception and attend an institution that does not offer graduate programs are placed in a terrible situation.

As a senior athlete at Siena College, a terrific institution that does not offer graduate programs, I understand that these athletes are left with very few options. They must either avoid graduating and delay pursuing their future or forego their final year of eligibility.

This is a horrible situation that no student-athlete should ever have to be in. Every student-athlete possesses a great passion for athletics. Each one of us loves to play, and more importantly, to compete. The current rule grants us the greatest opportunity to do that.

Ms. Street: Student-athletes feel that the impact on the affected institutions is minimal compared to what student-athletes gain from continuing their education in a program of their choice and having the chance to enhance their collegiate athletics career.

Based on all of this, the national SAAC urges the membership to vote "no" on the over-ride of Proposal 2005-54. It will be a shame to take away this opportunity from student-athletes.

Thank you for being here and for being proponents of student-athletes.

Mr. Austin: Thank you very much for your participation. Are there further comments?

David Goldfield (University of North Carolina, Charlotte): I would like to offer a faculty athletics representative's perspective on the over-ride, which I strongly oppose.

The NCAA sometimes gets into the habit of passing legislation and then three or four months later saying, "oops ... let's rescind it" or "let's modify it" without having the opportunity to see how that legislation might

work. The over-ride movement is based primarily on speculation on what might happen or what the worst case scenarios might be.

I urge the membership to not allow this proposal to be over-ridden and allow it to run its course for a year or two so we can develop data and see what the trends are. You are not going to get a trend after four or five months of operation.

I teach at a Division I-AAA institution. Potentially, this legislation could have a serious impact on our institution.

What is the NCAA? Is it a collection of coaches' associations, or is it a collection of academic institutions? I believe it is the latter. Our role as faculty, as presidents, as athletics directors and administrators is to educate and graduate our student-athletes. I think this proposal not only rewards that, but actually enhances that possibility.

I urge the membership to oppose this over-ride.

James Haney (National Association of Basketball Coaches): I appreciate the opportunity to share my perspective. I didn't come up here with the idea of sharing the vote of the coaches. From the coaches' perspective, the overwhelming vote is to over-ride this legislation.

I come as one who has a vested interest in the best interest of the game. Clearly, I see unintended consequences. I sent an e-mail to Division I athletics directors to share in their perspective. Let me share some of those thoughts.

First of all, it is great to graduate in four years. It is a wonderful accomplishment and should be proclaimed and acclaimed. The issue that I have in looking at this is offering the opportunity to be immediately eligible if you decide to attend another institution. Let me share these thoughts.

First of all, we have a great game right now. What we have seen over the last couple of years is the evolution of experience versus inexperience. Teams that are traditionally looked at as historically weak and find their way into the top 25 or 30 in the country and make their way to the Sweet 16 tend to be more immature. They are young, very talented freshmen and sophomores.

We have also seen the rise of experience and the value that experience has for the vast majority of institutions in this country. The result of that is a George Mason and seeing upsets in the regular season in November-December when we have inter-conference games.

The loss of a single player with three years of experience from your team or the addition of an experienced player to your team is definitely going to have an impact on the game.

Secondly, I think there's a reason that there were low numbers of transfers this year. One of the reasons is that people just were not prepared for it and didn't know about it. In men's basketball, we have an APR in terms of meeting standards, so more and more basketball players are going to school year-round. I think we will see in the years ahead more and more student-athletes in a position to take advantage of this opportunity to transfer and be immediately eligible.

The third point I would make to you is not a wonderful topic in terms of sport. But, in fact, there is recruiting that takes place. Unfortunately, it is not prospective student-athletes who are being recruited. It takes place with student-athletes. We find this from the eighth grade on with their advisors—they might be a parent, they might be an uncle, they may be a street agent. They may be very well-intentioned. In some cases they are not. But when a prospective student-athlete makes a decision to go to college, these people don't go away. They continue to offer their input. They offer their input in terms of how much playing time that player is getting and whether he is being used the right way. Is he getting enough shots in the game? Is he in the game at the right time? What ends up happening is that we have this sort of underground going on within men's basketball.

As these advisors become aware of this opportunity to transfer, I think you are going to see more and more discussions with players about how they could play well at your school, how they could get more attention and how they could get more TV visibility by transferring to another institution. I don't think that we saw that scenario this year in terms of the frequency of transfers, but we will see it in the future because these people are out there.

The final thing that I want to talk about is the integrity of the game. To me, there are two issues that are new

to the integrity of our game. One is the NBA's rule that prohibits a high school athlete from being eligible for the NBA until he completes a year of college basketball.

For those kids, coaches will take them in the hopes that they can convince them not to leave after a year and to stay and enjoy the college experience. Those coaches are trying to impress upon those kids the value of an education and the importance of getting a degree.

At the same time, they are going to be advised that they can go to the NBA and make a lot of money. We are going to see some of these kids—who are right now being acclaimed as the best freshman class ever or the best freshman class in men's basketball for the last 20 years—leave. I think that this whole idea that somebody comes in for one year and they somehow can change the course of history of a particular team effects the game's integrity. The back side of being able to transfer to another school and be immediately eligible can have the same effect.

I encourage you to vote "yes" on the over-ride.

Kenneth Kavanagh (Bradley University): I support the over-ride, although I have to say it pains me to do so.

Idealistically, I would love to be in a situation where we thought that our system of institutional responsibility would take care of itself. Unfortunately, we need a 460-page Manual to take care of this. We have rules and more rules, because every time we create a rule, some segment of the population that has a self-interest decides they are going to go around it. Unfortunately, I have some specific examples to show that if we wait a few years, it is only going to hurt our member institutions, as Jim was just talking about.

We currently have a fourth-year member on one of our teams in a situation in which they are one of the best members of our conference in terms of talent. They have already been approached through secondary sources about the opportunity to use this rule so that they can transfer at the end of the year. Also, over the last few years, we have documented tampering that resulted in two student-athletes being illegally recruited away from our institution. Unfortunately, a slap on the wrist was given to those institutions and no protection from our system was given, whereby the rewards that were shown were much worth the risk.

I ask you to support the over-ride. In turn, let's create new legislation that will provide flexibility for those deserving student-athletes who have the support of their institutions without creating a chaotic free agency.

Josephine Potuto (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): I oppose the over-ride vote.

I would like to note a couple of things. I would first like to embrace what both the student-athletes and Professor Goldfield said with regard to the particular proposal that is now subject to over-ride. But I would like to add a couple of things.

One, as I understand it, this bylaw still is subject to permission to transfer requirements. If permission to transfer is not granted, the athlete can leave and pursue a graduate education and play ball at that next institution but cannot get a scholarship. It strikes me that that will serve as some disincentive to the potential of large numbers of students transferring.

I would also like to add what strikes me as a picture of what is happening in intercollegiate athletics. Coaches can go from one school to another school without consequence. We have a number of other kinds of considerations now with regard to the demarcation between amateur and professional. Student-athletes on basketball teams and others can go to the pros after a year. Now, we are looking at a proposal that will allow a student-athlete with one year of eligibility remaining, who has already graduated, not to leave. I think that is a pretty sad picture of where we are. Thank you.

Carol Iwaoka (Big Ten Conference): I would also like to respond to some comments made by the student-athletes and to Jo's comments about the academic endeavors of the student-athlete.

Our conference is in support of this over-ride because we also support the academic pursuits of student-athletes that now are acceptable through the transfer process through the ARS waiver system. Our opposition is not because we do not support student-athletes who graduate within four years to be able to transfer, but that they are able to transfer through a waiver process that has quality control, because it is for academic and not athletic reasons.

We hope that a successful over-ride will continue to have this process in place so those student-athletes who truly deserve to transfer for financial, academic or personal reasons can still have access in that manner.

The motion to over-ride Proposal No. 2005-54 was approved, 196-83-2.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—NUMBER OF CONTESTS —FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION

Mr. Austin: We will now entertain a motion to over-ride the action of the Board of Directors from the NCAA Football Championship Subdivision to defeat Proposal 2005-128, which would permit 12 football games in that subdivision.

William Meehan (Jacksonville State University): I am a member of the Division I Presidential Advisory Group. On behalf of the 11 presidents and chancellors of the Ohio Valley Conference, I move the over-ride of Proposal No. 2005-128.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to make a few points. First of all, this is permissive legislation, not mandatory. Allowing the 12-game schedule provides consistency to a schedule that is not always consistent from year to year. It provides our student-athletes an additional opportunity in football to play. It does not lengthen the regular season and it provides an opportunity to balance our schedules by playing in-state rivals or other close rivals.

I urge the support of the over-ride by voting “yes” for this.

Jarrell Johnson (Western Illinois University): Thank you for your comments. Good afternoon, everybody. It is good to see everybody’s shining faces this afternoon. I represent the fine student-athletes of the Mid-Continent Conference—the one over there. Hi, guys.

On behalf of the national Division I SAAC, there are several issues that we would like to address in support of the addition of that 12th game. I currently am an FCS football player. That says enough right there. I speak for all my FCS peers when I say that it would be more than thrilling for us to have a chance to get out there and play another game in front of a crowd. Having that opportunity to give us another chance to compete also keeps up a team’s morale and rewards the loyalty of our fans.

Additionally, we all know that the FCS is a playoff structure system, and that means that only a limited number of teams can compete for that championship. If we are allowed a 12th game, that will give teams like mine in tough conferences that are on the bubble a chance to be eligible for the playoffs.

If this proposal is adopted, it will give athletes such as me a chance to go and play at the next level and a chance for that additional work and much-needed exposure.

The Division I national SAAC strongly urges you to support this over-ride.

Mark Wilson (Tennessee Technological University): I make one simple point on this legislation. Across all of our sports in Division I, we play the same number of contests. I believe that we should do that for our subdivision in football as well.

Jon Steinbrecher (Ohio Valley Conference): To borrow a phrase from those great believers in permissive legislation, the Grateful Dead, the 12th game legislation has certainly been on a long, strange trip—having been passed twice at the Management Council level and then defeated twice at the Board of Directors level.

So here we are again. We are asking to do on an every-year basis what we now do on a periodic basis. In 2002 and 2003, we were permitted to schedule 12 games. We had that opportunity again in 2008. The 12th game did not introduce a bias until the selection process for the championship for the simple reason that even when you are playing an 11-game schedule, there is an uneven number of games based on the number of non-Division I and FCS teams that you play. If it is okay to play 12 games on an occasional basis, certainly it should be permissible to do so on an annual basis.

We urge your support.

[The motion to over-ride Proposal No. 2005-128 was defeated, 50-55-0.]

Mr. Austin: I appreciate the indulgence of all of you in getting through these two votes.

Thank you again for being with us. The meeting is adjourned.

[The Division I business session was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.]

DIVISION II FORUM

SUNDAY, JANUARY 7, 2007

The Division II forum was called to order at 8:38 a.m. by Pfeiffer University President Chuck Ambrose.

OPENING REMARKS

Jill Willson (Texas A&M University Kingsville): Good morning. I'm Jill Willson, the athletics director at Texas A&M-Kingsville. I'm very happy to be here with you this morning to share some exciting news about Division II. We would like to welcome you to the issue forum sponsored by the Division II Management Council. We appreciate you taking the time to be here. I know a Sunday usually is for sleeping in, so I appreciate your support this morning.

I do promise that we will finish by 10 a.m. this morning. I would encourage you then to attend the other Division II educational sessions throughout the morning. Handouts for today's session were available as you came into the room. If you didn't get the handouts, you may want to do that now.

Before I go into the focus of today's forum, I do want to do two things: One, I want to give a special round of applause to the Division II SAAC (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee) for its support of the Make-A-Wish Foundation and the \$118,000 that Division II student athletes from across the country raised. I'd also like to thank you for your support and your institution's support. So let's give each other a round of applause for Make-A-Wish. (Applause)

DIVISION II FORUM

The focus of today's forum is Division II strategic positioning. We are honored to have Dr. Chuck Ambrose, president of Pfeiffer University; Rich Luker, principal of Relay Sponsorship and Event Marketing; Dave Smith, chairman of Creative Street Media Group; and NCAA staff member JoJo Rinebold, on the stage with me. Before we begin our program, I would like to recognize members of the 2006 Management Council. Division II Management Council members, please stand and be recognized.

This forum is designed to provide Division II delegates with the opportunity to discuss a critical issue identified by the Management Council for this year's Convention. As you come to the microphone, please identify yourself by name and affiliation as you address your constituents. As a reminder, individuals wearing Convention badges that are red, purple or green are permitted to speak. Those with other colors are visitors and may only be observers.

The Presidents Council and Management Council have spent the better part of the last 18 months working with various entities to find the Division II niche, its position, where we belong within the Association. The initiative began in earnest in 2005 when the Chancellors and Presidents Summit occurred. It's gathered momentum since, leading us to the point where we are today. We have gathered information from institutional representatives, student athletes and the general public on perceptions of Division II. We have gathered an advisory group of top Division II administrators who have worked together to tie the Division II identity with the community-engagement initiative. In short, we have done our homework. We're ready to show you what we've been doing and how much farther we need to go.

Dr. Ambrose will begin by giving us background information on the initiative. The NCAA staff will provide us an overview of the strategic-positioning platform. Rich Luker and Dave Smith will provide information on the community-engagement initiative and the Web site. Then Dr. Ambrose will conclude by providing an overview of Proposal No. 5, which will be voted on by the membership in tomorrow's business session. At that time, the Management Council would like to see greater membership input on the initiative. Once formal presentations have concluded, we'll allow some time for questions and answers. I encourage you to ask questions. We need further discussion on the initiative so that we can share in Division II's future.

I will turn the program over to Dr. Ambrose. I hope you enjoy the presentation.

Chuck Ambrose (Pfeiffer University): Thank you, Jill. Good morning. I share with Jill an appreciation for all of you who have a sense of the importance of what Division II is, where we are, where we've been, and more importantly, where we're going. This is a Convention that focuses not just on issues, but the opportunity and potential that we share together as Division II members.

Membership migration. The movement of institutions among NCAA divisions and from outside. Ticker envy. Why aren't our different athletics contests on ESPN's scroll across as we watch on weekends? "We are not Division I because ..." "We could be Division III because ..." That's the position we found ourselves in before the June 2005 presidents and chancellors summit in Orlando.

I don't know if you're like me, but when the NCAA gathers here, you either feel like you've been here before or déjà vu has taken over, and you wonder if you're coming again. But without question, we gather with a sense as a division in perhaps a rather defensive position about our identity and our position.

As presidents and chancellors gathered at the summit, these challenges were put to the test on several fronts. The financial viability of what it takes to be a Division I member was challenged with the Orszag study, which found that people were certainly not making a decision about divisional membership on the basis of revenue or what kind of funds would be generated by that type of movement.

As we discussed our identity and positioning, it became clear that there was a common theme and appreciation for what the Division II athletics experience meant, and that perhaps it was time to move from defense to offense and take those things that were the very best about Division II and find some way to position us through a means by which it could help not only the division create a stronger sense of identity, but could be extended to conferences and to our campuses to strengthen the student athlete experience, because that's the core of why we do what we do in the integration of athletics into campus life in the first place.

This has been a journey. As many of us who have been involved and all of you who have supported this effort know, like many journeys, it's a marathon and not a sprint. This marathon began at our summit. It resulted in the Presidents Council receiving support from Dr. Brand and the national office staff to say, "If you want to create a stronger sense of identity, you need to do this not on what you feel, but through an effort that substantiates the heart and core of where you are, what people perceive you to be, but more importantly, what your potential is." That encouragement led to an effort that was both qualitative and quantitative that JoJo is going to describe in a moment.

As we look across the representatives of our Division II constituent groups, we are deeply appreciative of your engagement. Student athletes very quickly took hold of this effort and we had to close the Web site down 48 hours after it was opened. We had approximately 2,000 responses. The message was very clear. There was a reason why you chose Division II. Presidents and chancellors, boosters, and coaches were great participants in that process. All of them came back with a common reason.

This quickly emerged as something that was not simply branding. Not to minimize the work our friends who work every day in branding the Association or the division, but this looked as if it was an opportunity for the division to take a strategic position that defines how everything that we're about, everything that we do and the way that we allocate our resources could be aligned with a positioning statement that was clear about where we hoped to be and be very inspirational as well.

I hope by the time that you go home you have a half-dozen or more copies of our strategic-positioning platform. As a divisional attribute within the Association, this is one of the most powerful tools that we can maintain as a division to bring forth an incredible experience for the students-athletes who we serve and who bridge the academic achievement on our campuses and the athletics competition that we so much enjoy. It's a relational setting that we all enjoy to a point that that's why we do what we do. It's a means by which we give student athletes, our coaches and our entire campus constituency an opportunity to be the front door to community and put each other in a sense of togetherness in terms of building, not only stronger campus communities, but our communities at large. What a great position that could be for our division.

That is a strategic position. That's not a brand. That's not just what we call ourselves. That's what we do. For those of you who had an opportunity to be at a distinctive Division II opportunity in Pensacola—the Sports Festival—when that platform was rolled out with the creative energy that you're going to see, it really was a clear

example of what this platform is. Six national championships awarded on a single day. The most championships ever awarded by the NCAA on a single day. Six habitat homes built in a cul de sac that helped Pensacola recover from hurricanes. That was a means of building community.

Dr. Brand was there recognizing the athletics and academic achievement of our student athletes. We recognized with the SAAC a Colby cross country runner who is not only a SAAC member, but now an All-American after his performance at Pensacola. It was a great platform to roll out the “I Chose” theme.

As we consider legislation and move forward into the coming year and a second CEO summit this summer, the “what” is now in our hands. Our responsibility together is how to make this platform come to life and take this unique opportunity that we have to define ourselves by what we are, the values we enjoy and the integration of athletics and academics, to a point that clearly defines the student-athlete experience and make a difference not only for Division II, but for our conferences and our institutions.

Usually when we gather for Conventions, we focus on legislation and all the details that go into it. We’ll certainly do that. We have important legislative initiatives to consider Monday. But all of these legislative initiatives lend themselves back to the strategic position of the institution to maintain a sense of purpose and to put life into balance for a student athlete’s experience and enjoy the work that we do together in celebration of the efforts that we’ve made to “I chose” why we are here.

As JoJo comes up, I want to give a word of appreciation to our national office staff. We’ve gotten tremendous support. It started with Dr. Brand, who said, “Any effort Division II makes to strengthen its identity and purpose strengthens the overall Association.” With that, the door was opened wide for us to undertake the study. From start to finish—and we’re only the first quarter of this effort—the branding staff, the communications staff, Terry, Mike and our Division II staff have really made a difference. JoJo, we look forward to you describing the first steps we took in this race. Thank you.

JoJo Rinebold (NCAA Staff): Thank you. Good morning, everyone.

Although I feel as though I’ve done this presentation many times, I’m always struck with a great deal of energy when talking about it because this has been a really enjoyable process. Those of us who have been involved in it talk about that June 2005 starting point and think, “Gosh, where were we a year ago? Where were we six months ago?” This process has moved along very quickly. But it has been done the right way. I always want to make sure that we emphasize that point. The Division II leadership committed to this being a research driven process and that we take the time and effort necessary to do it correctly. As we embark on the activation of the strategy, I think we’ll see that come to fruition.

I want to touch on three pieces of this initiative that were crucial and were necessary to exist. The first was the research part that we talked about; second was building the strategy; and then third is the activation of those elements.

Without the research, you can’t build a strong strategy. If you build a strong strategy but don’t do anything with it, you still haven’t met the mark. So the activation and the creative expression then becomes the next stage of it. Also, as you go into legislation, as you go into other programs and initiatives, it will always bring you back to identifying what Division II is all about, what its mission is, what it stands for. If that always serves as your touchstone, then you know that you’re doing it correctly.

In terms of the research, let me bring you back to the fall of 2005. That’s when the research process began. We embarked on some focus groups in four different cities. The focus groups were with the general public and with Division II institutions. In March of 2006, we did a qualitative study. It was an online survey. As Dr. Ambrose mentioned, it went to about 2,000 student athletes and individuals within the membership, and then about 1,000 from the general public. The response rate to that was overwhelming, as President Ambrose mentioned. People really wanted to give their opinions about Division II.

I think every step along this process indicated that people are very passionate about Division II. There is a great deal of pride in who you are and what you do. I think people were just looking to articulate that in a way that was relevant to their various audiences.

After we got the research back, we looked at what strategy we could build off of the information. If I could for just a moment give you some context on the general public, and then we’ll talk about the Division II mem-

bership and student athletes.

In terms of the general public—this is a Division II session, but for a moment I want to take you outside of that mindset and talk about how the general public perceives the NCAA as a whole. While we have made great progress in helping people understand what we're about -- athletics and academics, and what we do as an organization—we still have quite a ways to go.

There is still a general lack of understanding about what the NCAA mission is. So if you think about it in that context, understanding Division II is even more vague to them. If they don't understand what the organization does, they're not going to understand what any given subdivision does within that overall structure. I wanted to give some context to that, because that's the starting point of where we are with the general public. That doesn't mean that you don't try to chip away at that day after day. You have to recognize that the general public is a huge pool to swim in. You have to pick and choose your points that are going to be relevant to whoever you are speaking with.

More importantly, in the research that came back from the membership and the Division II student athletes, what was very clear—especially from student athletes—was that 90 percent of them came back and said, "I would recommend this experience to any prospective student athlete." Think about that in real life in terms of a consumer product. If you have an experience with a restaurant or a product or an electronic gadget, and if 90 percent of the people come back and say, "Yeah, you have to buy it. Yes, you should look into it," that's a pretty big success. To know that 90 percent of our student athletes said this has been a good experience, that's very significant. I look at the front row and hope that I have nodding heads that would agree with that statistic. Three-quarters of the student athletes rated their experience as excellent or very good. Again, those are very positive results.

There was another really interesting thing that came back. We asked the question, "What do you perceive the Division II priority to be?" We gave about seven or eight different choices. It was everything from newspaper exposure, television exposure, marketing support, promotion and community engagement.

Overwhelmingly, the membership came back and said it wants more support and engagement in the community. That ran above television and newspaper exposure. That's not to say that those things aren't important. But one of the things that started this whole initiative was Dr. Luker's presentation in Orlando to the chancellors and presidents that said TV exposure is great, but look in your backyard and see if you're maximizing what you have there. The research came back and emphasized that same point.

So when the research came back, we said, "Okay. This is all really great information. Let's build a strategy based on that." That became the foundation of the document that you have in front of you—the strategic-positioning platform. I want to walk you through that so you can understand how you can use it to your benefit as you go back to your campuses and conferences.

At the very top is the NCAA mission. Going back to what I was talking about earlier, in terms of the understanding of the organization as a whole, it's essential that this is built with the overall Association mission in mind. This mission is verbatim from our strategic plan. So when the Division II positioning statement is built, it's a complement to that. They are complementary to each other.

In the statement of "Life in the Balance" there are a couple of key words that really jump out. I want to emphasize those. Going back to where we were in the summer of 2005, there was this general feeling that Division II was in the middle. It's the balance. Division I is perceived as having the highest athletics programs possible. Division III is perceived as having the highest academic programs possible. Division II is someplace in the middle. It must be a balance between those two things.

Really, it's more than that because balance tells you it's the balance of two things. We found through the research and through talking with people that the Division II experience is more than just two. It's comprehensive. The words used in here are, "comprehensive program of learning and development in a personal setting."

"Personal setting" came through loud and clear, not only with student athletes, but also with administrators, in that there is a reason that they chose the Division II experience. Not only did the student athletes know their coaches and the community, but the faculty felt like they knew the student athletes, and the faculty knew the coaches. Everyone felt like they knew the individuals involved in their Division II programs. That's where the

personal setting comes through.

The second sentence talks about what this comprehensive program of learning development is. It's the academic achievement, it's learning in high level athletics competition and it's the development of positive societal attitudes in service to community. Those are all very important things that lend themselves to the Division II experience.

Finally, what is the benefit of having that kind of experience? The benefit is that the experience will provide student athletes with a path to graduation, while cultivating a variety of skills and knowledge for life ahead.

If 90 percent of our student athletes come through their experience recommending a Division II experience to future student athletes because of those same things, I think that is a great source of pride for the division. It's something that can be used as you talk about not only your institution or your campus or your conference, it's about what Division II stands for as a whole.

Beneath that are the attributes. Again, those were built on the unique attributes of the NCAA parent brand.

Then we go into audiences. Who exactly is it that you want to talk to? Who do you want to tell this story to? These are the people who we talked to in the research, but this is just a starting point.

In terms of national benefits, when you're engaging people who may not have a good level of knowledge, they're going to ask, "What does this mean to me? Why do I need to know about this?" The benefits that are listed are things that will be relevant to them.

Finally, you think about how you engage in that conversation. "Okay, you've explained this to me well, but how do I still know that all these things that you're saying are true and are accurate?" Well, there are 12 reasons to believe, that's your evidence. These aren't things that are fancy words that we've all made up. This is an accurate portrayal of what Division II stands for.

In terms of what you do with this document, it's been used in a variety of different situations. As you're going out to talk to somebody and wonder, "What do I say?" this will serve as a good starting point. We're not necessarily saying to bring this with you and read it verbatim. But this is how you connect what Division II is and what the mission and value is of your institution and your conference.

Those two things coupled together give any one of these audiences a very clear picture of who you are and what you stand for. That's ultimately what this strategy is all about. It's a tool to help you talk about what Division II stands for in a very consistent, clear manner. You could be having a conversation about a Division II school in California, and it should be very similar to a conversation that's happening about a Division II school in Missouri.

After the positioning platform was built, it became the daunting challenge of how to turn this document with lots of words and a lot of explanation into something that is creative, engaging, exciting, interesting and is quick. As we all know, in society today time is limited. You don't have a lot of time. As you're going down a highway, your attention span is quick. You'll see very few words on billboards. Everything is designed for quick consumption because people can get information in so many different ways. If it's not relevant to me quickly, I'm moving on to the next thing.

So how do you turn this into something that is relevant and creative and resonates with audiences? That's where the creative expression came into play.

I'm sure you have all seen throughout the Convention and throughout the Division II programs and discussions, the use of a hexagon. That hexagon is meant to symbolize the six attributes of Division II. The hexagon should never be out there by itself. It should have an explanation around it that connects Division II and the NCAA.

If people are seeing something that says, "I chose Division II," as we did at the Sports Festival or if somebody in Pensacola sees a sign that says, "I chose NCAA Division II," they're going to ask, "Well, who chose it, and why did they choose it, and what is this Division II?"

If you've done something to make someone ask a question or to engage in a conversation, you've set a stage to talk about what Division II is.

If you don't open up that conversation, that gives your audience the ability to assume on their own what they think Division II is, and no conversation has taken place.

So the creative and the strategy help create that conversation and dialogue.

In terms of activation, we're developing an activation kit that's going to the Division II membership to give you resources so that you can talk about your Division II programs in a way that's consistent and helps you with your audiences. Your future student athletes, your current student athletes, your trustees, your community leaders, parents, corporate supporters—everybody who you want to engage in what you do—these resources are going to be tools to help you talk to them. That's what is going to be meaningful.

We don't have enough money in our Association budgets to educate the public about what Division II is—or what the NCAA is for that matter. That's why this has to start from the ground up. It has to be grassroots. It has to come through individual Division II campuses and conferences.

Rich Luker is going to talk about the community engagement initiative that is an extension of the strategy. Go into your backyard. When you go into your backyard, here is what you're saying to them; here is how you work with them. Rich is going to talk about that. Dave Smith of Creative Street is going to talk about some creative expressions that we have developed.

Before I turn it over, I again want to emphasize that this process has been so exciting because it has been done textbook—the right way. So many times we've worked with activation without strategy or research, and you have to do the best you can. I really look forward to seeing what this turns into in three, five, 10 years to see what it turns into. I think the momentum is tremendous, and I think there will be great results to come. So with that, I will turn it back over to President Ambrose.

Mr. Ambrose: I'm going to stand up here with JoJo for a second. A lot of creative work has gone into this. To see that, we're going to watch a video.

To extend that thought JoJo had about the platform, which describes what Division II is on the front. We've talked about it with colleagues, conferences and other institutions. Turn it over and consider what the strategic positioning statement would be for your institution as it relates to why you do what you do with intercollegiate athletics. That's one reason we all choose Division II.

[Note: An audiovisual presentation was presented to the delegates.]

Rich Luker (Relay Sponsorship and Event Marketing): This is community. That's what it feels like to me. When I stand among a group like this, it feels like community. This is what I do for my job, but this feels like community. I look around the room and recognize faces, and the faces I recognize are faces I want to be around.

If you look around the room, I'll bet you're going to share that experience. You're students and you're going through college or you have your jobs. But as you look around the room, doesn't it feel like community?

If you looked around the room and you didn't recognize anyone, or even worse, if you looked around the room and you didn't like them, that wouldn't feel like community would it?

That's what this is all about. How wonderful it is when what you do for a living can match what we want to be as people. We want to be community. We need that, and we lack it.

One element of the overall platform in the Division II positioning is service. There's a very interesting juxtaposition between what service is and what community engagement is. Community engagement is part of that service plan. But you know what? The service part is down cold. If you're a faculty member, you're judged on three bases: On your teaching; on your research; and on your service.

We do service well. We have a tremendous opportunity to take that service component and make it personal—make it something that's meaningful for us—in the same way as when I see friendly faces. It makes me feel good.

I want to remind you why this is so important. You may have noticed who Time magazine appointed as their person of the year. It's not a person. The magazine acknowledged that our society has changed so much that all of the individuals in this nation are important.

There is a subtle and important shift in the way our culture is moving that goes beyond the statement that Time magazine made. It's that we are now individuals in a group. We don't, as a nation, typically now look at one another and say, "Gee, friendly faces, familiar faces, folks I want to be with." We miss that tremendously.

How has that happened? Our culture changed. In the 1850s we were farmers and we hung out as families;

in the 1950s we were manufacturers and most of what we produced as a nation was produced in factories, so we hung together as cities. Since 2003, better than 70 percent of all we produce as a nation economically, is done by individuals in a service based economy. We don't have to be in the same place at the same time. We don't have to know each other. There isn't an economically derived reason for us to be community. Yet, that's what we want. We want that ability to be together, to be meaningfully connected.

Colleges and universities have that core proposition, the basis by which we can find a literal place to be together and by context a lot of very good reasons to be together.

Athletics really forms the heart of that front door, the front porch, the town square, that is the university environment. We have service nailed. We're out there as colleges and universities in our communities serving on a daily basis.

What's missing is the opportunity for people in the community to gather with friendly faces. We're not taking advantage of that the way we can. That's what the community- engagement initiative allows us to do.

Over the last year we worked with advisory groups all the time. I can't think of any instance in the 25 years that I've done this kind of work that has been as rewarding and as much fun as working with the Division II community advisory group for this community initiative.

You received a program that looks like this report. It's by no means a finished product. You have to finish it. There's a lot of good thinking by your peers about the things we need to do to be more engaged as a community. It's a great plane read. I encourage you to read it on the way home and to think about it. I'll bet it's going to spark something that's going to bring a great community idea to your campus. That's the purpose of this document.

But there's more that we're going to do, as you'll see. We have started pilot programs with five schools across the United States. I started the first one before the end of the year with the University of Wisconsin, Parkside. Oh, my. These people are already doing it right. When I started looking at what was going on at that campus I said, "Do we really need to be here?"

Do you know they have a dean of community engagement? How many of you have that? How incredible is that? This dean came out of the Compact for Community Engagement. That's about 1,000 schools that are really dedicated to the service sector. Do you know what their response was when they saw the material that I just shared with you? "Boy, there's so much more that we can be doing." And there is.

Over the course of the next year, we're going to work with five schools. The purpose of the pilot program is to try to determine the process that schools can go through in a more dedicated, formal way to become more community engaged. There are ways to work with more elements outside athletics inside the university and with the communities themselves. That's what we'll do with the pilot programs.

But it's interesting. As we were going about this process, you have to ask, "Is the rubber going to hit the road? Are we going to get traction?" As JoJo said, you can have great ideas, but if people don't do it, what are they worth? One Management Council member at a meeting in August, was kind of like this (indicating head in hands). I hate it when you get people who are like this (indicating head in hands) because I'm thinkin, "Oh, my goodness. What am I saying wrong? Am I doing something wrong?" He sat there and was thinking through all this and he says, "Boy, I'll bet you I can do this."

On his way home, he came up with "A Taste of Coker" idea. They had the president cook some stuff. They had the athletics director cook some stuff. Other people cooked some stuff. They invited the community. They met them on the soccer field one evening. In less than three months' time, from no idea to a successful program that brought in hundreds of people who had never been associated with the campus or with athletics or even knew they had a soccer field that had lights. By the way, it raised money for the school.

That's how simple this is. It's a matter of looking out and saying, "Friends, family, let's do more of this. Let's be more engaged."

I was afraid when we started this process that we would have to create the wheel. We don't. It's already being done. I talked about the service side of it. The fact is, ideas like "Taste of Coker" exist out there, too.

The two biggest things we've realized over the last year is that we need to communicate and we need to coordinate. The left hand does not know what the right hand is doing. You can sit down with a soccer player, who

will talk to you all day about their service programs. Then say, “Okay, what’s going on in basketball?” They don’t know.

You have basketball games. You have football games. How often in those basketball and football games at half time do you make announcements for the drama program, the music program, arts? That’s community. Those are the opportunities that people have to come and see familiar faces and want to be there.

How often do people come to you after the first time at one of your sporting events and say, “Gee, I didn’t know I could...”

I have to share one story. We’re having a visit at a campus. There’s this guy who is on the board. I’m saying, “Wouldn’t it be great to have greater access?” The athletics director is there. He says, “Gee, I’d like it if I could just go for walks around the track.” The athletics director says, “You can.” I said, “No, he can’t. If his perception is he can’t, he can’t.”

It’s as simple as saying we want to communicate what’s possible and coordinate our efforts so when that guy comes you can say, “Not only can you attend those events, but you can come to 50 other things as well.”

It’s not a matter of doing more. It’s doing what you do better. One of the perceptions we have is that we’ll give you the resource and the odds are you’ll do fewer things. Maybe now you’re doing five or 10 different activities to try to draw in the community. Maybe you’re not thrilled with the results. But we’re saying maybe you don’t do five. Maybe we’re more careful in how we help you identify three activities that really work and have those be very successful. You end up spending less time with greater results.

I talked to you about how the pilot program is going to help schools that want to do the whole enchilada. They want to take the whole package.

On the other side, we’re going to start a Web site that will be a resource for identifying programs like “Taste of Coker” that work. You’ll be able to go on the Internet and push a button that will direct you to a soccer program in the evenings in October that will attract middle schoolers and 20 programs come up and tell you how to do it, how to succeed.

You’ll also have the chance to comment on them and add your own. That’s going to get you to programs that are tighter and better.

Is John here? Yes, right here (indicating). If you’ve got one of those good ideas, at the end of the session please corral him, because he’s collecting the good ideas that will be going on your Web site.

The bottom line is this, folks: It’s about doing what you already are doing. It’s doing what you, yourself, want. We want the familiar faces. We want the comfort of family and friends. You have the front porch. You have that attractive, wonderful, easy opportunity to be friends. Make the most of it.

To help you understand how we are going to activate the Web site, it’s my pleasure to introduce Dave Smith.

Dave Smith (Creative Street Media Group): Thank you, Rich. Good morning, all.

I’d first like to echo a sentiment that Rich had earlier. How energizing it has been to work with your colleagues, the NCAA staff and, of course, with the student athletes, on generating the kinds of tools that will express the research and the strategic platform that JoJo described.

One of the most exciting things we’re doing is the Web site that will provide one of those legs of the tremendous community that you have. As Rich said, you already have that community. Our job is giving you the tools to take advantage of your assets, simply and easily and quickly.

We have a blueprint of what that Web site will look like when it becomes live later this spring.

[Note: A PowerPoint presentation of the Web site was shown.]

You can see that the first slide is the welcome page or the landing page. We determined that the first phase of the Web site would be a password protected site—kind of a clubhouse of Division II schools that can assign those they wish to be able to come in and exchange ideas and take advantage of the ideas that you’ll see.

When you first come to the site, it will look like this (indicating), although it will be a lot more dynamic. You can see that it reflects the branding design that’s been developed. But the site will be changing colors and photographs that you see on the left. Very appealing.

Once you log on to the site, you’ll find the home page. There, you’ll see it broken into three key sections. The key to making a Web site work is to keep it simple so you can get to the information you need very quick-

ly.

The first section concentrates on information that will help you develop that better approach that Rich talked about. On there, you'll find Rich's presentation about the connection between Division II and the community initiative. You'll find other tips, tools and interviews that will help your institution get better at thinking through this process and making connections.

The second major section contains the actual ideas that were described. Here, you'll see feature stories like "The Taste of Coker" that will take you to that initiative and be accompanied with pictures and comments. It shows you how that was done step by step to see if it might be a good application for your school.

At the bottom of the page, there will be a search engine that allows you to search through these ideas very efficiently by sport, time of year and the resources that you'd like to devote.

Finally, the third section is a very important section in making this community really come alive. You can post your own comments in a less formal way than the "Recipe of Ideas" section. Here, you'll be able to share with your colleagues information about programs that you've tried, how you were able to make one better than it was when you saw it, what your reaction is to other issues that arise, and have a continuing conversation that's going to help shape this community and make it all that it can be.

That's what we have for you today. We'll look forward to seeing you and talking with you later this spring when it actually goes live.

Mr. Ambrose: As you can tell, with the partners that we're developing on these efforts and the enthusiasm of Dr. Luker, it's hard not to be infectious about the development of community.

If we go back to two of the primary goals that we started with in June of 2005—the ability for Division II to be more community engaged and relevant and meaningful, as well as to create a broader sense of regional awareness and understanding of who we are and what we're about—they certainly are within reach through the platform, the branding, the community engagement opportunities and our partnership with CSTV, which we heard about yesterday from Tim Perneti, the senior vice president. The Division II partnership has only begun to scratch the surface of telling the Division II story. All of these things, along with our legislative agenda that we will work on tomorrow, become alive with our positioning as a division.

Just for a moment, consider our work in the business session tomorrow. In light of our strategic-positioning platform, consider the fact that we have 22 legislative proposals. In those 22 legislative proposals, consider them in regards to what it means to really, truly as a division provide a comprehensive program of learning and development, eligibility issues, membership issues, and sport specific issues that are important.

As a representative of the Presidents Council, I have deep appreciation for the commitment and engagement of our colleagues, and previous colleagues who have served on the Presidents Council. They have really made this opportunity available to all of us. One legislative proposal that's very important to this initiative is Proposal No. 5.

It is important to Division II legislation and bylaws for us to consider not just support, but perhaps a historic amplification of this as an opportunity for us. As part of the community engagement group—and Rich is right, it's a very animated group of individuals who have helped put this whole effort together—a subcommittee was formed to really look at our constitution, bylaws and legislative process and ask, "What could we do to be more community engaged?" A series of proposals were bounded together under Proposal No. 5 that basically takes away the inhibitors that bind us from considering activities that relate our institutions, our student athletes and our athletics staffs to any efforts that help us build a stronger sense of community. I'm appreciative of that subgroup because I think they put out a list that says, "We're going to attempt to do things a little differently than we have done in the past."

This perspective is going to require us to trust each other. Consider this as a piece of legislation that, as Mike Marcil used the term, lifts the "curtain of silence" that used to come down so that game contestants couldn't hear each other. Proposal No. 5 lifts the curtain of silence for community engagement activities. There would be no impact on the other activities related to recruitment and the things that really regard how we come into contact with each other.

As this was proposed, and the community engagement report was made to the Presidents Council, we had

one of those “ah ha” moments about the strategic processes that made us feel like it’s really coming together. Dr. Bob Brown made the comment, “This is when I knew we were really serious about being different.”

There’s been a lot of thought and support from the Management Council and others in consideration of these proposals to make certain that it’s not going to take students out of class time and that community engagement activities are going to have some sense of institutional approval process so that it’s not done on an island or without consideration of a larger institutional plan. It meets all those criteria that Rich pointed out about communications and collaborations.

I really appreciate the deliberations from the conference level and throughout the governance structure that are taken on all of our legislation, but particularly the discussions that have been centered on Proposal No. 5.

The Presidents Council certainly is committed to make this work. If there are adjustments that need to be made, we can do that. If there’s abuse of legislation, we certainly will not want that to happen. We would facilitate a response to adjust.

But in regards to being community, let’s take away those things that keep us from becoming a community. Let’s take those activities that we have to go around or adjust, or can’t do them well, as Richard suggested. That’s why Proposal No. 5 is so important.

We really appreciate your thoughtful consideration as we move to the business session tomorrow to pass that piece of legislation.

Thank you for what you mean to this effort. It is a reflection of us. It’s not a committee. It’s not a council or a subgroup. It’s your voice being amplified in the identity of Division II and a pathway for us to look to the future and our potential and where we’re headed.

Ms. Willson: At this time, we would like to take any questions or comments that any of you might have. I welcome anyone who can help us, whether they’re questions or comments, to approach the microphone.

David Riggins (Mars Hill College): Thank you, Jill.

Rich, you might be in the best position to answer this, because as we look at this community-engagement piece, all of us are doing community-service initiatives. Can you give us a clear definition of how this initiative separates itself from what we’re already doing in terms of community service?

Mr. Luker: Yes. Great question.

There are several ways to think about it. One is, who is benefiting and when?

When you think about community service, who is benefiting? Is the community out there? For instance, with Habitat for Humanity we’re going out and building houses. We’re feeding the poor. We’re reading to kids in classrooms. Those are very good, very wonderful activities, and we can do more of them. But the emphasis is much more on reaching out to them in a beneficial way, something that is meeting a serious need. I can’t underscore that enough. That’s very good. That’s incredible.

I suggest that community engagement is equally needed. It’s just often ignored because it’s the fun part.

While we were out looking at several different colleges, the faculty athletics rep said to me, “Well, isn’t this community light?” I stepped back a minute. I wasn’t sure if he was saying that in a positive or a negative sense. But as I thought about it I said, “Yeah, that’s exactly what this is.” Let’s lighten up. Let’s find ways where the benefit is that we get to relax, we get to enjoy each other.

Here’s another way of distinguishing it from service. Think of your own lives. You’ve had a hard day. You go home. Do you go home and try to find some serious way to do somebody else some good? That’s not what you’re looking for, right? You’re looking for a very simple way to relax and unwind and enjoy yourself. Somehow, that’s gotten lost.

The community engagement initiative is to take advantage of opportunities to relax and unwind. And the place is on campus. It’s doing things largely on campus.

Sometimes it will extend to things that are in the community, but it benefits those who have come to your campus. It’s for simple enjoyment. It’s not for serious remedies. I’ll tell you why.

If that wasn’t happening, service would be a huge part of this. But after studying our research, we realized that 85 percent of the campuses in the research said they are involved in community service. By and large, there are programs outside the athletics program that are doing it as well. Not only does this happen in the athletics

department, it happens in the schools themselves. That isn't where the great need is.

The great need is to have this place, your campus, where people can come and be with each other in meaningful ways that are more about enjoyment than they are about accomplishing something super serious.

Look at what we are. We're sports. We're athletics events. Let's be honest, when people come to our events it's because they're a relative or a friend. It's not because they feel a part of the school. Community engagement will find new ways, like "Taste of Coker," to invite people to come for their benefit and enjoyment. When they come to an event like "Taste of Coker," they go, "Wow, that was fun. I'd like to be here. I'd like to belong to this place. I'd like to do more." They'll say, "Well, what else is there?" You can reply, "There's going to be a volleyball game. You're welcome to come to that tomorrow." They come and see a couple of their neighbors. They're saying, "Gee, this works just fine. This is like a hometown." Then they come again and again.

All of a sudden, they're coming to your games because they have adopted you. "It's my school now. It's my community. It's my town square."

The distinctions are these: That when you're talking about service, largely the whole university already is engaged in that. By and large, that's a more serious endeavor, and for the most part it takes place off campus. When we're talking about what our great opportunity here is with the community-engagement program, it's on campus. It's the fun part. It's that simple. It's a wonderful way of just being together.

One thing that you can do that endears you to the rest of your campus is to not think of it as just athletics. It's an opportunity to highlight those other wonderful, fun, simple things like drama, music, art and other things of that nature.

Ms. Willson: Dr. Luker brings up a very good point. We will be helping you along the way, not only with the Web site, but with a copy of the video and some printed materials. There will be an opportunity in April for your conference to send two representatives to Denver, Colorado, to have a kickoff for this event.

We will have an activation tool kit that we will help you with and that we hope you'll help us with. As Dr. Luker said, there could be activities that you might want to replicate. If Nancy has got a great idea at Northern Kentucky, I want to know about it so I can do the same thing.

That's exactly what we're going to try to do within our own family. We're going to try to share those ideas so that we can all make it much simpler for ourselves.

Matthew McDougall (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): Good morning. I'm representing the student athletes.

Have you thought about tapping student athletes?

Dave, could you set up a page similar to the page that you have for institutions for student athletes? Sometimes student athletes think on a different wavelength and think for a different group of people than maybe the administrators do. I think there are plenty of intelligent ideas that we could bring and help you with your strategic initiative.

Mr. Smith: You're exactly right. Some of your colleagues already have. There has been student athlete involvement on the community advisory group. I think we all saw very quickly that everything you're saying is exactly right. The student athletes have immediately grasped this. Some of the best ideas from the group came from them.

Dr. Ambrose made the point that we're in the first quarter of the initiative. As it develops and as this site matures and becomes everything that it can be, I think you'll see that. The site may be totally public at some point so that groups in the communities can come in and learn some of these same things.

It's not meant to be restrictive; however, it is meant to be controlled. Schools can make that decision of who can come onto the site and how they would like to filter that information. But I think it's clear from what we've seen that energy and insight from student athletes are going to quickly come into the system and be absolutely critical to the development.

Mr. Luker: It was in our thinking from day one that there would be a section on the site that was definitely dedicated to student-athletes. In fact, we went a step farther. There's one that's for students, because there's this other side of how nonstudent athletes see this area that we need to understand as well.

It's not in the first iteration, but we need to work with you and nonstudent-athletes to know how to bridge

that gap so we can get the best of the student athletes' ideas and the best of nonstudent athletes' ideas. That's been our thinking from day one.

Mr. McDougall: Thank you.

Mr. Ambrose: Matt, thank you for bringing that up. Through this journey, that's something that our branding experts told us. The voice of student athletes telling a story and your perspective is perhaps one of the most powerful tools that we can take advantage of as we go back to our campuses and tell the Division II story. We're conscious of your time and how you can do that. But any way that we can find to use your voice and your perspective is really important.

William Woodward (Seattle Pacific University): I'm the faculty athletics rep in the Great Northwest Athletic Conference. As I think about the implications of this in the abstract, I get kind of enthused. Then I look at particular cases in my conference and in my region of the country, and it seems to me there are some very significant differences in application based on the location of the institution.

In a small city where the college is "the university"—as is the case for a couple of schools in our conference—this will be outstanding. It's brilliant. It benefits the institution. It benefits the city that is located in small-town rural environments.

For colleges located in the center of a large city, I'm not seeing it as much. If a college is in a major professional sports team market and the elephant from the Pac 10, how can we tailor it so that there actually is an application that those of us who are little fish in big ponds can work on as well?

Mr. Luker: Great question. That was one of our biggest challenges as we thought about this strategically. The fact is, one size does not fit all. There's no question about that.

Some of the earliest work that we did was actually some "geocoding" analysis of the nation, but we still haven't quite finished. One of the resources that will ultimately be available to you will be the ability to look at your school and compare its demographic configuration with other schools in a similar context.

It's a whole lot clearer sailing if you're in a city where you're the only college in town. If you're in a city like Philadelphia or Boston, in some of those places there are 50 schools. So whose town is it? That is a major challenge we have.

We thought of defining it by zip codes or by public school districts or by the high school in your area. The initial realization was that maybe we will help define for you what you are. Then the realization we had was that we will provide tools in the tool kit that ultimately will help you think about the attributes of your community that are more attractive.

For example, there are some markets where the unmet needs are among senior citizens. There is a very large population of senior citizens, and there are not a lot of fun things for them to do. There are things you can do there. In other places, they're having a real boom with young families, so you could focus on preschoolers. Some communities are more technologically involved and others are not.

Rather than prescribe for each school what your context is like, we're going to give you something that's kind of like a checklist of things to ask yourself. You can decide among some of the resources we'll provide where the greatest opportunities are for you.

I'm also going to answer a question that wasn't asked. What do you do if you're a Division II school and you're in a city where there's also a Division III school? Are they competition? No.

This is opportunity. We're giving you as many tools as we can for you to do it right among your constituency as you see it. If everybody does this, that's an awesome thing. This nation needs to be more of a community. I don't think there's any question about that. But it's fairly untapped ground right now. How you define your community is going to be pretty wide open, because no one is taking an approach like this to define the community and serve it in this way.

Finally, we're visiting a lot of schools. Some of them have been like the schools you're suggesting, such as Metro State in Denver. We visited Metro State in the fall. There are ways to bridge the gap. One of the most successful things we've seen is where you have an active president or chancellor who joins community groups like the chamber of commerce or the hospital board and says, "Hey, we're here. How can we be more of a community to you?"

It's amazing what these folks are telling us. They say, "Wow, we always thought of the campus on the hill. You're off on the side." In fact, it's interesting how our campuses are laid out. They're almost like fortresses off on the side. When the leadership of the school goes out to whatever the local community is and says, "We want to be involved," it starts there. They readily come back and say, "Hey, listen, this is great. What we'd really be able to use is..."

So I recognize what you're saying. There are not hard and fast solutions. It's not one size fits all. We're hopeful that there are going to be a number of tools that will help you define for yourselves. As you do this and you're learning, let us know so that we can pass that on as others ask us. Like Dr. Ambrose said, we're in the first quarter, and it's a long game.

Ms. Rinebold: A school that is in a Boston market competing with the Red Sox is in a very different situation than a college in a very rural community. So how do you deal with that? The important component about having a conversation is that there could be so many advocates for you, your program and your institution, but your advocates don't know what to say because no one has told them what you're about.

A very basic starting point is educating your advocates because they may not be supporting who you are. Not because they don't support you, it's because they may not know. If there's a starting place for where the strategy is, it's finding a way to talk about who you are and who the division is on your terms as opposed to them assuming who you are and what you are.

Ms. Willson: JoJo reminded me of something. We do hope to have the activation kit ready for you in the fall of 2007. As we said, we're in the first quarter, but we're trying to get you as much information as we can by that time.

Were there any other questions or comments?

CLOSING REMARKS

I do have a couple of closing comments.

The Division II educational sessions will follow the adjournment of this session and will be held in Sun Ballrooms B, C and D. We have nine different sessions in three different time slots. There will be three sessions in each slot. I know that all of you will try to find a couple of sessions that will pique your interests, and we hope you'll enjoy those.

Division II presidents and chancellors programming will be held after this session. The first two hours of the program will be in Osceola Ballrooms 1 and 2. Lunch will be in the Miami Room.

The delegates' reception is tonight from 5 to 6:30 in Exhibition Hall F. The Honors Celebration will follow that reception in Osceola Ballrooms A to D, from 7 to 9.

Don't forget the Division II business session tomorrow will begin bright and early at 8 a.m. sharp. If you haven't already done so, please pick up your electronic voting unit and your paddle for the business session tomorrow. Both items will need to be with you for voting. You won't have time to pick those up tomorrow morning, so make sure that you do that today.

We do have a gift for you today. Those of you who are interested in an "I Chose Division II" T shirt, you can pick one up as you exit.

Also, copies from this morning's presentation will be available at tomorrow's business session.

On behalf of the Management Council, I do want to say a special "thank you" for your attendance. I do hope that as we go forward, you, like the rest of us, will know that Division II is the place to be and is a great place to live and work.

Thank you for your time this morning. Get a shirt on the way out.

[The Division II forum was adjourned at 9:55 a.m.]

DIVISION II BUSINESS SESSION

MONDAY, JANUARY 8, 2007

The Division II business session was called to order at 8:35 a.m., with Division II Presidents Council chair Chuck Ambrose, Pfeiffer University, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Ambrose: Good morning. I'm Chuck Ambrose, chair of the Division II Presidents Council.

Before we begin the formal part of our session, I'd like to express appreciation to those who have made this Convention program and our work together as Division II possible. Our Division II staff works incredibly hard to position our work to be efficient and effective. That includes our vice president, Mike Racy; Terri Steeb, our director; and Ruth Reinhardt. Anyone who has been through the structure of this Convention knows how much work it takes. As a group of delegates, I would like to express appreciation to them if you would. (Applause)

Surrounding them are staff members from membership services and our governance staff who have many other responsibilities beyond Division II. We appreciate their involvement.

I also would like to thank Gary Brown along with Dave Pickle. Gary has been very thoughtful and comprehensive in the coverage, not only of this Convention, but in the progress we have made together. Gary, thank you for what you've done for the division through your work on The NCAA News.

The officers and members of the Management Council and Presidents Council are with us. I would like to introduce them. Our Presidents Council vice chair joins me here in the front, Eddie Moore, Jr., from Virginia State University; our Management Council chair, Jill Willson, director of athletics at Texas A&M University, who is in the back section; our Management Council vice chair, Mike Covone, who is chair of championships and director of athletics at Barry University, representing the Sunshine State Conference, is right here in the middle section.

I'd also like to introduce the individuals joining me. Larry Fitzgerald, who is the former faculty athletics representative at Southern Connecticut State University, will serve as our Division II parliamentarian. He's to my left. Also on the dais with Mike and Terry, are Stephanie Quigg and Leland Zeller of our NCAA membership services staff. They are here to help us with legislation questions, issues and interpretations.

Finally, we are appreciative of your presence as our work begins.

There are several announcements to make that will guide the course of our business. I need to review the Division II voting process.

[Note: Delegates reviewed voting procedures and tested electronic voting equipment.]

As this test is moving forward to make certain that our equipment is working correctly, I and the different bodies that work through the Division II structure want to give thoughtful appreciation to all of you for your engagement with this effort that we have called strategic positioning.

Eighteen months ago, when presidents and chancellors gathered in Orlando for a summit to consider this initiative, we did not have a strategic position for our division. We didn't have an identity that we could claim with certainty. But we had a sense that what we do, how we do it and where we do it within Division II institutions is both special and makes a transformative difference in the lives of our student-athletes. Our work together, your responses, your engagement, your suggestions and your dialogue have created a new theme for the division of, "I chose Division II."

You should have found a folder that includes several beginning products of our work. This folder includes our strategic-positioning platform. I encourage you to take this platform and consider it not as a piece of paper, but a means by which we can consider our work today. Take this platform home, juxtapose your core values and attributes and key features that are included within your athletics programs. Let's work together to transmit and amplify the meaning and significance of a Division II experience to everyone we come in contact with.

This process has been a journey. We have defined it at this meeting as being in its first quarter. We have an educational video available that we're going to show you as we begin our voting that gives us some context of where we are and where we can go together.

[Note: An audiovisual about Division II strategic positioning was shown.]

Throughout this process, we have had many partners who are with us today. Sport Graphics helped prepare the creative look and the booklet that is in your packets. It has a more thorough written description of the creative application of the strategic-positioning platform. The videos are available to take home to use in appropriate ways internally and externally. The video will help you find applications that can assist you in telling the Division II story.

MEMBERSHIP REPORT

I'm now going to ask Eddie Moore, our vice chair of the Presidents Council, to give our membership report.

Eddie M. Moore Jr. (Virginia State University): Good morning. While we continue to test our equipment and analyze the results, I'll take care of some preliminary business.

Again this year we have produced a written version of the Management Council, Presidents Council and budget reports in the form of a yearbook. You should have received a copy of the yearbook at registration. The yearbook contains committee reports and information about Division II. This yearbook assists us in conducting our business sessions more efficiently. It provides written reports and important news that you can take back to your campuses. I encourage you to share the yearbook with staff that is not at this Convention.

I'll highlight some of the important information in the 2006 yearbook.

Page 9 has an updated summary of Division II facts and figures and a quick overview of the benefits of being a Division II member. The summary provides a snapshot and profile of Division II membership.

For more in-depth analysis of Division II membership, I encourage you to read the 200506 Division II membership report that was mailed to your institutions this summer.

The Division II news makers and headlines section that begins on Page 19 and runs through 32 highlights some of the accomplishments of Division II student-athletes and administrators during 2006. We should be proud of these individuals in our Division II family.

The Division II strategic-positioning initiative is on Pages 42 through 45. The video was prepared to highlight this initiative. Under the leadership of the Presidents Council, the division has implemented a strategic-positioning platform that is at the core of what Division II does.

This strategic-positioning platform provides us with an opportunity to celebrate who we are, what we believe in and the potential that we can reach together.

The following sections contain 2006 Presidents Council, Management Council and committee reports. The reports deliver important information regarding the initiatives undertaken by each group. I encourage you to read all committee reports and contact the committee chair or staff liaison if you have questions or concerns.

Please review the Division II budget information on Pages 69 through 73. Division II budget principles have resulted in significant surpluses. These unallocated dollars continue to help fund championship enhancements and Division II television and broadband coverage. We are able to pay for these initiatives without tapping into enhancement funds or conference grants.

Pages 75 through 84 covers Division II championships, the SAAC initiative as it relates to the Make-A-Wish partnership and the 200607 degree-completion scholarship program.

The accomplishments in 2006 were significant for our division. We appreciate the good news that it points to for next year. For a look at 2007 priorities, refer to Page 85.

I hope this yearbook continues to be a useful tool for you. Time has been set aside at the conclusion of our legislative business for questions and comments about the yearbook and the governance of Division II.

I'd like to recognize an intern, Melissa Lehman, who had the primary responsibility for putting this yearbook together. (Applause)

That concludes my report.

Mr. Ambrose: For those of you who recognize that technology drives our lives and the efficiency of our electronic voting mechanisms, I'm going to ask your patience. We are only registering about 90 votes off that first test vote. I'm assuming that everyone attempted to cast that test vote. We're making certain that it's not an equipment malfunction.

Instead of taking a full break, I ask for your patience as we check the equipment. Talk among yourselves, and I'll call us back to order after we determine what the problem is.

[Note: A brief recess was taken.]

Mr. Ambrose: Please be seated. We'll go back to our first test vote.

[Note: Test votes again were taken.]

We are now wired and ready to move forward.

CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION

Before we start our voting this morning, Robert's Rules of Order provides procedures therein that may be superseded or replaced by any organization's traditional and customary procedures. This Association has a number of such legislative requirements and procedures that are reviewed in the introductory section of the Official Notice.

In addition, the Official Notice has several appendixes that list procedural information that may assist you.

NCAA Convention procedures are designed to ensure fairness and equitable treatment for all members and to expedite our work as delegates. We intend to apply these procedures throughout our business session.

There are certain procedures we employ to use our time wisely and efficiently. I'll briefly review those procedures.

[Note: Business session procedures were reviewed.]

Before we begin voting, Dr. Myles Brand, president of the NCAA, has joined us. You heard Dr. Brand's comments about the position of Division II on our educational video. This initiative would not be possible without his leadership. The NCAA mission and the positioning of the collegiate experience, which he has articulated at this Convention in terms of fairness and the alignment of our strategic-positioning statement, is meant to lift up and build a better NCAA. Without his leadership, this would not be possible.

I'd like to recognize Dr. Brand to express our appreciation. (Applause)

Our first action is to approve the Official Notice. If we vote to accept the Notice, we will vote on the proposals in the order that they appear. By adopting the Official Notice, you are adopting the emergency legislation adopted by the Presidents Council as described in Appendix B, Pages 55 through 59; the incorporation of interpretations described in Appendix C, Pages 61 through 67; the noncontroversial amendments in Appendix D, Pages 69 through 92; and the intentbased amendments in Appendix E, Pages 93 through 97.

These interpretations and amendments were approved by the Management Council and Presidents Council during the past 12 months. We will not discuss them individually unless you move to do so.

Do I have a motion to adopt the Official Notice so that we may proceed with our work? After that motion, we can consider motions to re-order proposals.

From the Floor: So moved.

Mr. Ambrose: So moved, and we have a second.

[Note: The Official Notice was approved.]

We are ready to start voting. The Division II Presidents Council has identified Proposal Nos. 1 through 3 as a consent package that is voted on as a group.

The Presidents Council identified Proposals Nos. 4 through 8 to be of particular interest to chancellors and presidents and included them in the Presidents Council grouping. After considering the Presidents Council groupings, we then will consider Proposal Nos. 9 through No. 23.

We will start with the consent package, Proposals Nos. 1 through 3. The proposals will be considered as a group, unless there is an objection. This is a paddle vote. The Management Council and Presidents Council have determined that these proposals are housekeeping in nature. That is why they have been placed in the consent package. Proposals Nos. 1 through 3 have immediate effective dates. However, since they are part of the consent package, there will be no separate vote on the effective date for the proposals unless someone moves to pull the proposals from the grouping.

CONSENT PACKAGE

Jill Willson (Texas A&M University-Kingsville): On behalf of the Management Council, I move Proposals Nos. 1 through 3 as a consent package.

[The motion was seconded.]

Each of these proposals is in the consent package because of the nature of the change being proposed. Each of these three proposals is noncontroversial or editorial in nature. Therefore, it's appropriate to vote on all three as a package.

[The consent package was adopted.]

NCAA MEMBERSHIP — DIVISION II MEMBERSHIP — MEMBERSHIP PROCESS — PROVISIONAL AND RECLASSIFYING INSTITUTIONS

Mr. Ambrose: We are now ready to look at Proposals Nos. 4 through 8. These proposals make up this year's presidential grouping. Proposal No. 4 is a roll-call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2007, for those institutions entering the membership process August 1, 2007, and thereafter.

David Brunk (Northeast-10 Conference): On behalf of the Membership Committee, I move Proposal No. 4.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 4 amends the membership process for provisional and reclassifying institutions interested in joining Division II.

Current membership trends indicate that the division must be strategic regarding its future membership growth. Proposal No. 4 will give Division II the ability to meet that change.

The new membership process will require institutions seeking active Division II membership to go through an exploratory period for a minimum of two years before moving to a provisional period. The provisional period would vary in length, but would be no less than one year.

If adopted, the Membership Committee will evaluate institutions interested in seeking Division II membership through a structured set of educational assessments to determine their readiness for active Division II membership. The educational assessments, as outlined in the proposal, must be successfully completed before institutions are invited to participate in active membership. Proposal No. 4 would be implemented for any provisional or reclassifying institution beginning on or after August 1, 2007.

The new membership process will provide a more streamlined process for strategic growth of Division II. I strongly urge your support of this proposal. Thank you.

James Netherton (Carson-Newman College): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 4.

Proposal No. 4 will unify the provisional and reclassifying member processes. Provisional and reclassifying institutions will be required to complete the same requirements before becoming an active Division II member.

This proposal will assist the Membership Committee in managing future growth of the division. It also will allow for the growth to occur at a pace that meets the needs of Division II.

Another key element of the proposal is the educational component that requires institutions to complete before being invited to active membership status. During the exploratory and provisional phases, institutions will be required to complete educational assessments that will be reviewed by the Membership Committee.

Through each step of the process, the Membership Committee will review the institution's progress and readiness for active membership. Institutions will be required to assess their athletics programs against the Division II strategic-positioning platform, the model athletics department document and complete the institutional self-study guide.

These educational assessments will help new institutions evaluate their programs and will help the Membership Committee determine their readiness for active membership.

I strongly urge you to support this proposal.

Joe Grunenwald (Clarion University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I also speak in support of Proposal No. 4.

Under current legislation, provisional and reclassifying institutions seeking Division II membership must go through two separate processes.

This proposal would streamline the process for institutions seeking Division II membership and provide them greater support in preparing to become active members.

The proposal also has a student-athlete well-being component. Proposal No. 4 will provide an opportunity for student-athletes at institutions seeking active membership in Division II to be eligible for participation in the NCAA championship events at a quicker pace than under the current process.

For example, current legislation specifies that a provisional institution must go through a five-year process before being invited to active status. During this five-year period, the institution is not eligible to participate in NCAA championships. Reclassifying institutions must go through a three-year process. During this time, they are not eligible to participate in NCAA championships, either.

Proposal No. 4 will allow all institutions proceeding through the new membership process to be eligible for NCAA championships in as little as three years.

The process is designed to permit institutions to be eligible for championships in their current division or association for a longer period of time while the school is assessing whether Division II membership is appropriate.

This proposal will streamline the new membership process and have a positive impact on student-athletes who attend those institutions. The proposal will make Division II membership a more attractive choice for many schools looking to enhance their athletics programs, and the assessment set forth in the proposal will ensure that schools are prepared for active Division II membership.

I strongly urge your support of the proposal.

[Proposal No. 4 was adopted, 258-0-1.]

RECRUITING AND AWARDS AND BENEFITS — STRATEGIC POSITIONING AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT INITIATIVES

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 5 is a roll-call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2007. Please refer to the green procedural issues document to reference the two noncontroversial changes and the one interpretation for Proposal No. 5 that were approved by the Management Council. We'll take a motion for Proposal No. 5.

Thomas Harden (Clayton State University): I'm speaking out of turn, but I would like to move Proposal No. 5.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Presidents Council, I speak in support of Proposal 5. This proposal helps establish an environment where athletics can be included in a school's partnership with the community that it serves.

Some of the current bylaws interfere with fully implementing the Division II attributes as outlined in the strategic-positioning platform. The recommended changes will support the division's new strategic-positioning platform, and the change will enhance the ability of athletics departments and student-athletes to connect with the community through various campus engagement initiatives without worrying about NCAA restrictions. This is what Division II is all about.

This proposal will eliminate some of the red tape that currently prevents the membership from truly reaching out to the communities and strengthening a relationship that is vital for both sides, while furthering the division's strategic position and our identity as a division.

For these reasons, I urge you to vote in support of this proposal.

David Brunk (Northeast-10 Conference): On behalf of the Community Advisory Group and the Management Council, I also speak in support of Proposal No. 5.

As previously stated, this proposal clearly emanates from the Division II strategic-positioning platform. This is not a recruiting change or simple deregulation, but a change to match the strategic-positioning platform for Division II.

This proposal grew out of a comprehensive study related to the defining characteristics and key attributes of

the division. The ultimate objective of this study was to clarify the division's strategic position and thus provide Division II institutions with an opportunity to celebrate who we are, what we believe in and why we do the things we do.

Research data indicate that a priority for Division II should be to increase support in the local community. A component of the Division II strategic position is community engagement.

Institutions that abuse the legislation will be subject to the enforcement process and a potential hearing with the Division II Committee on Infractions.

The Management Council and Presidents Council are committed to making sure that the intent of the proposed changes is fully implemented. This proposal will allow institutions to increase their standing in the community, and allow more students to say, "I chose Division II."

For this reason and the reasons previously stated, I urge you to vote in support of this proposal. Thank you.

Wayne Tanna (Chaminade University): I also speak in favor of this proposal.

Institutions of higher education have a long tradition of service to their communities. When colleges organize effective community service programs, they do so not only to meet the needs of the communities that surround them, but also to improve the academic and civic lives of their students, faculty and staff.

This is an issue that goes beyond the field of competition. This addresses one of the basic stated purposes that most, if not all, of our institutions of higher education stand for — service to the community, the nation and the world.

One would be hard pressed to find a university mission statement that does not include service as a central reason for the existence of the institution. Chaminade University is a small institution with a commitment to our community. The community that we serve is called Manoa Valley. Its public schools reflect the highest poverty rates in the city of Honolulu. The high school that serves this community, Kaimuki High School, is where I went.

Two years ago, I returned there as the chair of the school community council. I found some very disturbing things that I know that our institutions could serve to move forward.

Kaimuki is a failing school under the "No Child Left Behind" standards. The school serves a large number of immigrant families that have come to America to have a chance at a better life. The result of this is that one out of every three ninth graders is held back in ninth grade. Only about half of those who enter ninth grade graduate from high school.

The whole of Chaminade, athletics included, must serve this community. It is well beyond the time that our institutions of higher education step up to the plate in every way that we can. This is especially true when we're talking about assisting high school students, most of whom will never become college athletes, but who do represent our community and country's future. The benefits clearly outweigh the risk. Some see prospects. I see children.

I ask for your support in passing this proposal.

In conclusion, I ask delegates to reflect on the following: 100 years from now, it will not matter what kind of car I drove, what kind of house I lived in, how much money was in my bank account, what my clothes looked like, or how many championships I won or lost. But 100 years from now the world may be a better place because I was important in the life of a child.

I ask for us all to be important in the life of a child. Thank you.

Marian Broderick (Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association/Western State College of Colorado): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II SAAC supports Proposal No. 5.

This legislation aligns the Division II mission to foster a positive student-athlete image and enhance the student-athlete experience.

In addition, we are excited that this proposal cultivates strength in community relations for our individual campuses and allows student-athletes to have contact with community members during institutional engagement projects.

Both components lend themselves to improving the relationship between the institution and community, while bonding the athletics department to the campus community.

Further, the benefits of increased community engagement outweigh the possible benefits for recruiting that may be gained through such projects.

We encourage you to support this legislation.

Margaret Fitzpatrick (St. Thomas Aquinas College): I'm on the Presidents Council. We are in favor of this motion.

This is probably one of the most important pieces of legislation in the wholistic development of our students. Please vote in favor of Proposal No. 5.

Eric Guerra (Seattle University): With all due respect to the Presidents Council and those who have spoken today, I've been working hard to reconcile this proposal in my mind. In many respects, it carries a lot of benefits, as the last few speakers pointed out. But I think there is a logistical consideration here that really does have me concerned. I think there's a reality of the competitiveness of recruiting.

Our coaches do read this legislation. They read the book, and they know the language. I think language is very important. As I read the way this is drafted, and I would like to quote the recruiting regulations set forth in Bylaw 13 that "do not apply when institutional staff members (including spouses and other family members), representative of the institution's athletics interests and student-athletes are engaged in community engagement activities..."

I would like to caution us that this is going to be a very slippery slope. It's going to create contention on our campuses between compliance officers who really have to hold to the letter of the law when the language doesn't support the work that we have to do in terms of honoring the rules that we have agreed to regarding recruiting. I think this is something that we really need to consider.

I support the legislation and what it's intended to do, but we need to use caution. I request that a committee be formed to review the impact of this legislation in regards to recruiting, and that if necessary, amended legislation be proposed.

It worries me that we pass this and ride this wonderful wave of good feeling and disregard the fact that it's going to have an impact that I think is going to be difficult for our compliance officers.

[Proposal No. 5 was adopted, 255-3-2.]

Mr. Ambrose: I commend you as delegates. As one colleague, Bob Brown on the Presidents Council, has stated many times, for us to position the institutions that we serve in the Division II legislative process in alignment with who we are, this legislative proposal we just passed helps us to come alive. I consider this to be a historic moment for Division II and would like for you to give each other a round of applause for passing this legislation. (Applause)

RECRUITING — OFFICIAL VISIT REQUIREMENTS AND WRITTEN OFFERS OF ATHLETICALLY RELATED FINANCIAL AID — REGISTRATION WITH INITIAL-ELIGIBILITY CLEARINGHOUSE AND INSTITUTIONAL REQUEST LIST

We are now ready for Proposal No. 6. This is a roll-call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2007.

Deborah Chin (University of New Haven): On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee and the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 6.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 6 specifies that a prospective student-athlete must register with the initial-eligibility clearinghouse and be placed on the institutional request list before taking an official visit and receiving a written offer of athletically related financial aid, whichever occurs first.

This proposal is a recommendation from the working group appointed to review initial-eligibility trends. The working group was appointed to review recent trends in secondary school education and how such trends would impact NCAA eligibility.

It was noted that there is a growing trend of late registration by prospective student-athletes with the initial-eligibility clearinghouse. Late registration with the clearinghouse challenges the integrity of the clearinghouse process and provides the opportunity for continued abuses within that process.

Encouraging early registration by prospective student-athletes and institutional request list submission by institutions enhances the clearinghouse process and fosters sound academic behaviors.

In addition, prospective student-athletes are best served by early registration in that it provides time for advice and education regarding academic deficiencies.

This proposal adds integrity to the initial-eligibility process. For this reason, I urge your support.

James Lyons (California State University, Dominguez Hills): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I speak in support of this proposal.

In reviewing student academic records, it is clear that if the prospective student-athlete registered with the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse or provided academic information to an institution at some point during the senior year of high school, advice and education could have been provided to assist the prospective student-athlete regarding his or her academic eligibility.

Thus, requiring high school and preparatory school prospective student-athletes to register with the clearinghouse and be placed on an institution request list before an official visit or before being offered a written offer of athletic financial aid will ensure that the contact of the clearinghouse occurs at an earlier date and that issues surrounding academic credentials can be resolved.

Early registration with the clearinghouse is an opportunity for prospective student-athletes to have their record reviewed and for them to be advised and counseled in a timely fashion before competition.

I strongly encourage your support for this proposal.

[Proposal No. 6 was adopted, 208-50-1.]

FINANCIAL AID AND EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS — ELIGIBILITY FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS — STRUCTURE OF FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP CLASSIFICATIONS

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 7 is a roll-call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2008, for those conferences and institutions participating in the championship segment on or after August 1, 2009. This is also a football-only vote. Only those delegates from institutions and conferences that sponsor football can vote on this proposal; however, any delegate with speaking privileges is permitted to speak to this proposal.

Eddie N. Moore Jr. (Virginia State University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 7. [The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 7 would establish two national championship opportunities in Division II football.

One championship would be established for institutions that provide financial aid from zero to 36 total equivalencies. The other championship would be established for institutions that provide 50 percent or less than the maximum financial aid equivalency limit, or zero to 18 total equivalencies.

This new Division II football championship model would take effect in the 2009 championship season.

This proposal will require institutions or conferences on behalf of its member institutions to declare once every three years their level of championship playoff competition. This commitment would be binding for three years.

The creation of this model will enhance the competitive equity in Division II football and improve the student-athlete experience.

The Presidents Council strongly believes this change is best for the health of football and the long-range success of our division. I strongly urge support of this proposal.

Roger Thomas (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Football Task Force and Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal 7.

As previously stated, creating two national championships in football will enhance opportunities in Division II. The Football Task Force worked hard to develop a model that would not include a scholarship reduction for the sport.

For many years, football has been an issue that threatens the solidarity of our great division. It has been noted that some institutions leave Division II and some question whether to continue to sponsor football merely because of the challenges and uncertainties surrounding Division II football.

I have always viewed a scholarship reduction for Division II as a major step backward that runs counter to the philosophy of student-athlete well-being.

The Football Task Force believed that we needed to find a different solution to scholarship reductions. The majority of task force members supported the two national championship model.

I urge you to support this proposal. Thank you.

Douglas Kristensen (University of Nebraska at Kearney): We would like to explain our vote as a conference.

We are voting “yes” because we want to support the concept of change and expanded opportunities for student-athletes to participate in championships. I suppose there’s nothing I’m going to be able to say that’s going to change the fate of this proposal. Despite the efforts of the Presidents Council, Division II football is not going to be advanced necessarily by this proposal and certainly with these numbers.

The defeat of this proposal also will not solve the problems that exist with Division II football. The future of football west of the Missouri River is in serious jeopardy. This problem will not go away with our inattention.

I applaud Myles Brand for charging that task force to focus on the issue of scholarships and opportunities for student-athletes. It was a crucial issue. It was a crucial issue last year. It’s going to become more serious.

If we do not make some scholarship adjustments or some changes, there are going to be fewer opportunities for student-athletes across the country to compete for championships. There are fewer football schools, particularly in the west. That’s going to mean fewer and fewer opportunities for student-athletes. Those greater distances are causing greater risks, and they’re causing greater problems with conference alignments and memberships.

This morning when we watched the video, I was impressed by the individual who said they get goose bumps talking about Division II. I do too. My problem is I get cold chills when I think about the future of Division II football west of the Missouri River.

We plan to vote “yes,” but we understand the fate of this is in great jeopardy. We think that there should be continued dialogue because there are problems that must be addressed. Thank you.

Larry Holstad (Winona State University): On behalf of the Division II Football Task Force and the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 7.

The mission of the Division II Football Task Force was to study a possible change in the Division II football championship structure that would provide more competitive equity. This proposal does just that. By creating two division football championships, we will enhance and preserve the competitive equity in Division II football and greatly improve the student-athlete experience.

The proposal provides two championships, with a 50-percent break for the second championship. Other percentages were considered, but making the distinction between fully funded programs and those that are 50-percent funded made the most sense philosophically. This philosophical decision was made looking at what is best in the long-term interests of Division II.

This proposal allows every football student-athlete playing at the Division II level to believe that his team has a chance to be competitive for a national championship.

I urge you to consider your support of this proposal.

Joseph Grunenwald (Clarion University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I also speak in support of Proposal No. 7.

As previously stated, this proposal is about competitive equity in a sport that is at the heart of decision-making by many campus leaders about the NCAA division in which that school would choose to affiliate.

Division II Presidents Council members were unanimous in their decision to support the proposal. This proposal protects the current maximum financial aid equivalency of football and provides new opportunities to give programs that offer fewer scholarships a chance to be competitive in the postseason.

Jerry McGee (Wingate University): I have the privilege of chairing this task force.

I want to express my appreciation to the task force members for their hard work and dedication. We were given a difficult task. That task was to give the membership an alternative to scholarship reduction in football. We feel that we accomplished the task.

You have the choice to vote the proposal up or down. That’s how we do things in Division II. Together, we

will go forward in the spirit of cooperation to make Division II as good as we can possibly make it.

But before the vote is taken, I want to express my most sincere appreciation to the task force members. I've been able to chair several task forces of this division in recent years and have served on many others. These were the hardest-working and most-dedicated members I've worked with in my life. I want them to know we are deeply appreciative of their dedication to the sport.

Drew Waters (Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference): I'm a football student-athlete from the Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference. I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II SAAC opposes Proposal No. 7.

By possibly encouraging the reduction of scholarship equivalencies, this proposal ultimately poses a threat to student-athlete well-being because a reduction of even one equivalency can negatively affect many student-athletes.

Further, Division II student-athletes greatly express the desire to win "the" national championship, rather than winning "one of the" championships.

Finally, at a time when Division II is promoting a national identity, dividing the football championship structure would further distance us from achieving that goal.

We encourage you to oppose this legislation.

Pat Riepma (Northwood University): I'm speaking on behalf of the GLIAC (Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference).

I'm concerned that if we split football into two divisions we are setting a dangerous precedent that would allow other sports to pursue this same course of action.

I am blessed to be the athletics director and head football coach for the past 14 years at a small private school. What makes all of our jobs rewarding in Division II is a philosophy that athletes are students first and still compete for the right to be called the best in their sport.

Division II football is highly regarded. It attracts attention and interest throughout the country because we have one champion, and that one champion is decided on the field.

We have a great product and a great format in place, and we need to keep it.

I strongly recommend the defeat of this proposal. Thank you.

David Riggins (Mars Hill College): I've been affiliated with this proposal and the concept of no budget impact, and that's true.

I will say this in defense of the task force. I know Dr. McGee said they were given a difficult charge. We need to remember that when this thing started, we thought we could incorporate some Division I-AAs and some Division IIIs into this process. Once those folks opted out, then a difficult chore became an impossible chore. The task force did a great job moving forward.

We said no budget impact. That probably is true. Is there a cost? Absolutely.

As an athletics director, those of you that have football, we constantly fight that concept of football being the tail that wags the dog. Quite frankly, I'm not sure that I would like to see the NCAA foster that further on my campus by creating a special circumstance for football only.

I think that the other costs are to student-athletes. We're talking about moving a playoff opportunity from one individual to another. Right now, those individuals who lose those opportunities are nameless and faceless, and that makes the decision easy. If the season were played and then we had to make this decision, I think none of us would vote to arbitrarily move playoffs from one division to another or one section to another.

Finally, the other cost is to our conferences. We are a conference-driven division. I think that the first cycle—the first three years—we may survive it. But I think at the end of that first three years, we would have to see, because no conference would stay in lockstep. It would be very difficult. I think we would see a number, a significant number, of single-sport conferences in Division II. We've seen that in other divisions, and it's not been a healthy situation for them.

For those reasons, I ask you to please vote against this proposal. Thank you so much.

Mr. Ambrose: Thank you for this thoughtful discussion on an important division-wide issue that is a football-only vote. It is now time to decide Proposal No. 7 by roll call.

[Proposal No. 7 was defeated, 29-117-1.]

FINANCIAL AID — MAXIMUM EQUIVALENCY LIMITS — DIVISION DOMINANT PROVISIONS

Proposal No. 8 is a roll-call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2007. Please refer to the green procedural issue document to reference the clarification on the vote requirement for this proposal.

Herb Reinhard (Valdosta State University): On behalf of the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 8.
[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 8 will establish a new voting line for Division II that would require a two-thirds majority vote of all delegates present and voting at the division's annual or special Convention to modify the division's maximum financial aid equivalency limits. Therefore, any proposal that would increase or decrease the maximum financial aid equivalency limit in any Division II championship sport would require a two-thirds majority vote of those present and voting to adopt the legislative change.

This proposal addresses the concern of the Division II membership regarding the potential impact that a change in financial aid equivalencies would have on the stability of Division II membership and on student-athlete well-being.

Since financial aid equivalency limits are so inherent in decisions schools make about divisional affiliation, it only makes sense that any change to the equivalency limits would be supported by a two-thirds majority of Division II members.

Adopting this proposal makes it clear that any change to financial aid equivalencies should not be taken lightly by our members and that access to higher education scholarships provided to our student-athletes is a priority in Division II.

I strongly urge your support for this proposal. Thank you.

James Netherton (Carson-Newman College): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I rise in support of Proposal 8.

Per the NCAA constitution, the division-dominant provisions require two-thirds majority vote of those present and voting because they are the subject of extreme importance to the division. Financial aid is one of the important principles to Division II membership and our philosophy statement and should require a two-thirds majority vote when an increase or decrease to the maximum financial aid limits in all Division II championship sports is recommended.

By adopting the proposed change, the Division II membership will ensure stability in the area of financial aid and assure our student-athletes that they will not see dramatic increases or decreases regarding scholarships in their sport from year to year.

Further, providing athletics scholarships is part of the identity of Division II. Any potential decrease in athletics scholarships could draw us away from our identity as a division of high-caliber intercollegiate athletics in a setting where academic achievement and community engagement receive emphasis for preparing student-athletes for life after sport.

I encourage your support for Proposal No. 8.

Jerry McGee (Wingate University): I speak in favor of this proposal.

Proposal No. 8 provides stability to the financial aid maximum equivalency limits in Division II championship sports that in turn provides stability for our membership. Proposal No. 8 will benefit both our member institutions and our student-athletes.

As previously stated, the proposal requires a two-thirds vote before adopting any changes — whether it is an increase or a decrease — to the financial aid maximum equivalency limits.

We want to make sure the momentum we have started over the last year as it relates to the identity and strategic position of Division II is not slowed. Any modification to financial aid limits could possibly slow that momentum, which is why there is a need for a two-thirds majority vote to ensure complete support for such an important change.

I encourage your support of Proposal 8.

Carey Demos (Northeast-10 Conference): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II SAAC supports Proposal No. 8.

As Division II student-athletes, we are proud of and dependent upon the financial aid offered by our institutions. We further recognize that each equivalency can provide educational opportunity for many student-athletes.

While we acknowledge the financial responsibilities of operating collegiate athletics programs, we want all decisions affecting financial aid equivalencies to be tasked with rigorous and thorough thought and support.

The enactment of this legislation provides competitive equity and protects many student-athletes, while maintaining the stability and integrity of financial aid legislation.

We encourage you to support this legislation.

Doug Echols (South Atlantic Conference): I speak in opposition to Proposal 8.

Several years ago, I served as a member of the NCAA Division II Task Force. We looked at a new federated governance model for the NCAA. That was a challenging process. Ultimately, the model we now use was presented to the full Division II membership and approved.

During discussions in association with the work of the task force over a period of a year or more, a number of items were reviewed in relationship to the general voting status for Division II. One of the major points that we were able to continue from the old model that has served Division II well is the concept and the value of one institution and one vote, as it blends with the majority and the will of membership.

During these discussions, a number of options were discussed, such as weighting votes regarding the number of sports sponsored by an institution and weighting votes in relationship to the size of the institution or conference.

It was determined that Division II felt strongly about the value of one institution, one vote representation. That was approved by the Division II membership and has served us well.

If Proposal No. 8 is approved by the membership, we will move away from the value of institutional votes and the majority rule on questions before the body.

It is very possible, and in many cases likely, that a numerical minority on questions requiring two-thirds majority, would control the outcome of the question before the body. In other words, you could have a majority of the institutions and voters in Division II who are interested in changing the maximum equivalencies in sport, and this would not be possible because of the numeric minority.

The argument has been made in the framework of the motion that somehow questions about financial aid raise the level; that these decisions would need a simple majority in order to be approved. While I would not disagree with the importance of questions regarding financial aid or the impact on the full membership, the necessity to have a two-thirds majority in order to be able to change the maximum equivalencies is not necessary. The membership has always taken seriously any review of financial aid legislation.

Part of the rationale stated within the proposed legislation refers to assuring stability. I suggest that we have stability and that through the years we have seen very few changes, up or down, in financial aid equivalencies in any sport.

Additionally, the process that we have established requires two or more conferences or 15 individual institutions. The proposed legislation is not cumbersome. If we wanted to make it more difficult for financial aid legislation to come forward, we could perhaps increase the number of sponsoring conferences or institutions.

Changing financial aid equivalencies is an important matter and an issue Division II takes very seriously. But I believe that if there is a time that a majority of individual institutions with the full value of their single vote wanted to increase maximum equivalencies in a particular sport, we would not want to have that option taken away from the majority by the numerical minority of the voting body.

Nathan Salant (Gulf South Conference): I want to make sure that my understanding of the long-term effect of this is correct.

If I understand the legislation, all that this does is ensure that for one-plus years, but not more than two years, that two-thirds rule stays in effect. The reason being that at some point in the future, the membership only needs to vote by a majority vote to change this back to a majority vote requirement for financial aid. The only way that the two-thirds would have a long-term, more permanent effect would be if the amendment were made in the con-

stitution section, which I believe would probably be Bylaw 5, rather than in the financial aid section.

Mr. Ambrose: That is correct. We could give you further interpretation if needed. But as you stated, that is correct.

Mr. Salant: I wanted to make sure that everyone understands that this does only have a maximum of almost two years' effect and that if the membership at some subsequent point felt the need to go back to the majority, they would only need a majority vote to do so.

Anthony Capon (University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown): I've had a long, productive and close relationship with the Division II SAAC. It is therefore with reluctance that I take the position of opposing the SAAC position, but I must do so in this case.

No one disagrees with the premise that we want to protect opportunities for student-athletes. That's not the premise behind this proposal. The premise behind this proposal is that the current structure, which requires a majority vote, does not adequately protect those opportunities.

Those of us who are opposed to this legislation apparently have more confidence in the membership's ability to make the right decision than the sponsors of this legislation do. We believe that the membership, acting by majority vote, is sufficient to protect the opportunities of student-athletes.

The sponsors of this legislation apparently believe that we need a presumably wiser 34 percent to protect us from ourselves. I reject that position. I don't think that is in any sense correct.

Furthermore, I don't believe this legislation is necessary based on the history of Division II. I challenge the sponsor of this legislation to cite a single proposal that has passed in the past eight years that was so clearly contrary to the interests of student-athletes that we should have had this proposal.

Even the vote two years ago on reducing equivalencies in football wasn't that close. I believe that this legislation is unnecessary.

In addition, this legislation is contrary to the philosophy of Division II. Division II is a division that's based on one school, one vote and the majority vote. There is a division in the NCAA that does have a governance structure that isn't based on that. That's not Division II.

In speaking about the previous proposal, Dr. McGee noted that in Division II we have an opportunity to vote things up or down. I will quote Dr. McGee's statement on the previous proposal. He said, "That's how we do things in Division II." Dr. McGee is precisely right. That is how we do things in Division II. We vote by majority vote.

Paul Engelmann (Central Missouri State University): In the belief that we've now clearly heard arguments on both sides of this issue, I move the previous question.

Mr. Ambrose: That requires a two-thirds majority vote to call the question. Those in favor of calling the question, raise your paddle; opposed; abstentions. It passes. We're ready to vote.

[Proposal No. 8 was adopted, 130-125-1.]

AMATEURISM — DRAFT AND INQUIRY DRAFT EXCEPTION — ALL SPORTS

Proposal No. 9 will be moot. It is now time to consider Proposal No. 10. Proposal No. 10 is a paddle vote with an effective date of August 1, 2007.

Nathan Salant (Gulf South Conference): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 10.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ladies and gentlemen, Proposal No. 10 permits an enrolled student-athlete in any sport to enter a professional-needs draft an unlimited number of times during his or her collegiate career and to be drafted by any team in the league without jeopardizing his or her eligibility in that sport, providing the student-athlete does not hire an agent, sign an agreement with any professional athletics team or otherwise jeopardize his or her amateur status under the NCAA rules.

This proposal gives every student-athlete, not just those in basketball and football, a chance to explore professional opportunities on multiple occasions during their collegiate careers, while maintaining the principles of

amateurism as defined by the Association.

By permitting student-athletes to take advantage of this opportunity, we will treat student-athletes the same way we treat all the students at our institutions.

The proposal is very similar to students going on job interviews while still enrolled in college. The proposal would also allow student-athletes to be flexible when making the choice between turning professional or returning to their institution to continue their studies because student-athletes would not have to declare their intent to return to intercollegiate athletics.

It is also important to note that the increased publicity and exposure from having student-athletes drafted by a professional team is a positive outcome for both the student-athlete and the member institution that he or she attends.

There are probably also right-to-contract issues under state and federal laws that would further encourage us to enact this legislation. This proposal is a recommendation by the NCAA Student-Athlete Well-Being Task Force and satisfies the task force's goal of increasing the well-being of student-athletes.

Proposal No. 10 provides outstanding opportunities for our student-athletes and our member institutions. For this reason and for the reasons previously stated, I urge your support. Thank you.

[Proposal No.10 was adopted.]

AMATEURISM — PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES — CONTINUATION OF MODELING AND OTHER NONATHLETICALLY RELATED PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES AFTER ENROLLMENT

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 11 is a paddle vote with an effective date of August 1, 2007.

Heather MacCulloch (Bloomfield College): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 11. [The motion was seconded.]

Currently, if a student-athlete wishes to accept consideration for or permit the use of his or her name or picture to advertise or promote the sale or use of a commercial product or service, the student-athlete is required to have initiated that involvement before his or her enrollment in the member institution.

This rule creates a distinction based on the time at which the involvement in modeling or other nonathletically related promotional activity was originated. If we are going to allow the student-athlete to accept consideration or to permit the use of his or her name, why is it important to determine when the origination of such involvement occurred? It seems more important to allow all student-athletes with the opportunity to model while participating in other nonathletically related promotional activities, regardless of when the involvement was initiated, provided the other legislative conditions have been met.

It is important to note that all of the other conditions in the current legislation would remain. Therefore, the student-athlete must have become involved in modeling or other nonathletically related activities for reasons independent of athletics ability, and there can be no references made to the individual's name or involvement in intercollegiate athletics. The student-athlete does not endorse the commercial product. Any consideration received by the student-athlete is commensurate with his or her skill and experience as a model or performer.

It is important that we view this issue from the student-athlete's perspective. Passage of this proposal does not jeopardize any of the Association's other amateurism philosophies.

For these reasons, I strongly urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 11 was adopted.]

AMATEURISM — PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES — PERMISSIBLE — EDUCATIONAL PRODUCTS RELATED TO SPORT SKILL INSTRUCTION

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 12 is a paddle vote with an immediate effective date. There will be two paddle votes on this proposal. The immediate effective date will be considered first by paddle vote, and it needs a two-thirds approval to pass. After the effective date vote, we will then have discussion on the proposal followed by a vote on the merits of Proposal No. 12.

Anthony Capon (University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move

Proposal No. 12.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move the immediate effective date.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Pursuant to current legislation, a student-athlete may allow his or her name or picture to appear in books, articles or other publications, films, videotapes, and other types of electronic reproduction related to sports skill instruction or analysis. However, a student-athlete may not accept any expenses for such participation.

Proposal No. 12 would permit student-athletes to receive actual and necessary expenses for participating in activities related to sports skill instruction.

The proposed change would make this legislation consistent with current legislation permitting student-athletes to receive expenses for participation in promotional or media activities, but it prohibits the acceptance of remuneration.

Please note that other conditions of the current rule would not be amended by the proposal. Print or electronic media productions must be for educational purposes, the student-athlete cannot endorse the product or service, and the student-athlete must sign a release indicating that his or her name or picture is being used consistent with the requirements of the legislation.

In addition, this change strengthens the existing legislation by specifying that a student-athlete shall not miss class time to participate in an activity related to sport skill instruction. Thus, the proposal will implement a new safeguard protecting the importance of class attendance.

On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I urge you to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 12 was adopted.]

ELIGIBILITY — GENERAL REQUIREMENTS — GRADUATE STUDENT/ POSTBACCALAUREATE/SECOND BACCALAUREATE PARTICIPATION — TRANSFER ELIGIBILITY

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 13 is a roll-call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2007.

Ann Jirkovsky (Bellarmine University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 13.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 13 permits a student-athlete to transfer and continue intercollegiate athletics while pursuing a graduate postbaccalaureate or a second undergraduate or equivalent degree, provided the student-athlete has eligibility remaining.

This proposal further permits a student-athlete to continue his or her education and intercollegiate athletics participation at an institution other than the student-athlete's previous institution from which he or she received a baccalaureate degree without satisfying the condition of the one-time transfer exception.

Proposal No. 13 focuses on graduation. If the student-athlete has graduated and has eligibility remaining, he or she may continue intercollegiate athletics participation at any institution, regardless of how many times the student-athlete has previously transferred. As previously stated, graduation is the key.

In addition, the proposed change seeks to promote the principle of student-athlete well-being. It will permit student-athletes the opportunity to pursue additional or advanced degrees, while reaping the full benefit of intercollegiate athletics participation. The proposal permits the student-athlete an opportunity to succeed academically, graduate from an institution in four years and not postpone fulfilling his or her degree requirements, while furthering his or her desire to continue participation in intercollegiate athletics.

Further, this proposal will help ensure that our student-athletes are making appropriate academic decisions in their progression toward graduation.

Proposal No. 13 makes sound academic sense for institutions and student-athletes alike.

It is important to note that this proposal is recommended by the NCAA Student-Athlete Well-Being Task Force. The proposal satisfies the goals of the task force by increasing the well-being of student-athletes. Therefore, I urge you to vote in support of this proposal.

John Meisel (Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville): On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee and the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 13.

As Ann stated, this proposal is in the best interests of the student-athlete. The main purpose of a student-athlete attending college is to obtain a baccalaureate degree. We should promote graduation once a student-athlete has fulfilled the requirements to obtain a degree.

As we all know, there are some student-athletes who postpone fulfilling the requirements of obtaining a degree to complete their last season of competition. A student-athlete should never postpone obtaining his or her degree for intercollegiate athletics, and we should not promote that postponement.

We should instead promote obtaining a degree and develop ways to enhance a student-athlete's opportunity to continue participation in intercollegiate athletics. This proposal does just that.

This proposal displays how Division II is using intercollegiate athletics in a manner designed to protect and enhance both the physical and educational well-being of student-athletes.

It provides institutions another opportunity to maintain an environment in which all student-athletes — undergraduate or graduate — can have an opportunity to be involved in intercollegiate athletics, which is an integral part of the student-athlete's educational experience. If our concern is truly a student-athlete's well-being, then we should support this proposal. Thank you.

Lauren Brown (South Atlantic Conference): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II SAAC supports Proposal No. 13.

The proposal encourages student-athletes to use their athletic abilities while pursuing further education. Without the flexibility made available by this proposal, many student-athletes who register may intentionally delay graduation in order to use all four years of eligibility, which puts focus on athletics rather than academics.

This legislation recognizes the student-athletes who work hard to complete their undergraduate degrees and desire to continue their academic and athletic endeavors with the time remaining on their 10-semester clocks.

We encourage you to support this legislation.

[Proposal No. 13 was adopted, 233-24.]

ETHICAL CONDUCT — SPORTS WAGERING ACTIVITIES

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 14 is a paddle vote with an effective date of August 1, 2007.

Daniel Mara (Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference): On behalf of the Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct Committee and the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 14.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 14 amends the sports-wagering legislation to specify and clarify prohibited sports-wagering activities and the individuals to whom the prohibitions apply.

Given the serious consequences for violating this bylaw, which includes ineligibility and loss of employment, it is imperative that this rule be concisely worded and easily understood by the membership.

As previously stated, the proposal specifically identifies who is subject to the sports-wagering rule. By adding the president or chancellor, chief operating officer, and faculty athletics representative to the list of persons precluded from participation in sports wagering activities, it is clear that the rule is uniform in its application.

In addition, student-athletes, coaches, administrators and anyone who has responsibility within or over athletics, will be unequivocally subject to the clearly expressed rule.

Furthermore, this proposal would clarify the mixed message that is currently being sent to student-athletes, coaches and administrators regarding sports wagering on intercollegiate athletics. Proposal No. 14 will confirm that wagering on intercollegiate, amateur or professional athletics practice and competition is impermissible.

For these reasons, I strongly urge your support for this proposal.

Nathan Salant (Gulf South Conference): I think everyone here feels very strongly that all gambling activities by student-athletes are inappropriate. I don't think that anyone thinks that coaches should be gambling on

their own games. It's a bad example to set if they gamble on other games as well.

I'd like to point out two things that are realistic. I think everyone at some point in time has probably participated in an office pool or an office bracket for the NCAA Division I basketball championship. Fantasy leagues are so commonplace nowadays that it simply isn't realistic to include them in this legislation because we have absolutely no influence whatsoever in this legislation. I'm concerned about that because I think that many of us would have to fire everyone who works for us if we enforce this to the letter of the law.

I hate to see legislation enacted that includes something that we all know is going on. I encourage the membership to think about some parts of this that may be a little overly broad.

We support the prohibition on gambling, but I'd like to see at some future date something done about the fantasy league issue.

Thomas Harden (Clayton State University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 14.

Proposal 14 amends the sports-wagering legislation to specify and clarify prohibited sports-wagering activities and the individuals to whom the prohibitions apply.

The NCAA has long opposed illegal and legal wagering on college sports. Sports wagering undermines the integrity of our games and threatens the well-being of our student-athletes and college sports in general. For these reasons, it is important that our sports-wagering rule be clear and concise. This proposal clearly identifies the activities that are prohibited for our student-athletes, coaches and athletics administrators.

Such prohibited sports-wagering activities include Internet sports wagering, auctions in which bids are placed on teams, of contests or pools or fantasy leagues in which an entry fee is required and there is an opportunity to win a prize at the conclusion of the league.

Because it is important for all individuals involved in intercollegiate athletics to understand what constitutes wagering, I strongly urge your support of this proposal.

From the Floor: Just a point of information. Has there been a gambling scandal or point-fixing incident at any Division II school recently or in the past?

This seems like an awfully broad brush to go after a problem that has occurred at Division I schools. I'm not aware of it. Is anyone on the panel aware of this happening in any of our schools?

Mike Racy (NCAA Staff): We are aware through the enforcement staff of recent investigations and current investigations involving gambling. I don't know if it rises to the level of point shaving, but there are active cases involving sports wagering and gambling at our institutions.

From the Floor: Originally, all of this involved point-shaving scandals. Now we're getting more and more sophisticated types of legislation to go after a problem that really doesn't ... I mean, some of our kids may gamble on fantasy leagues or other things like that. But it seems like we're getting all this sophisticated legislation to go after a problem that may not really exist.

[Proposal No. 14 was adopted.]

PERSONNEL — CONDUCT AND ATHLETICS PERSONNEL — SPORTS SAFETY TRAINING

Larry Holstad (Winona State University): On behalf of the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports and the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 15.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 15 requires that all coaches present at each practice, competition, skill instruction and strength and conditioning session involving student-athletes be certified in first aid, CPR and automatic external defibrillator (AED) use.

The proposal also requires all coaches to be familiar with emergency plan activation policies specific to their institution.

The goal of this proposal is to ensure that all coaches present when student-athletes are participating in athletic-based activities such as practice, competition, skill instruction and strength and conditioning sessions are certified in first aid, CPR and AED usage to care for participating student-athletes during emergencies.

The survey of the NCAA benefit plan since 1992 reports 60 percent of all nonvehicle-related deaths have been due to heart-related conditions and that 83 percent of all deaths occurred during practice or conditioning. In addition, data from the NCAA injury surveillance system indicate that the majority of sports report most of their injuries during practice simply because there are more exposures.

These incidents warrant increasing all institutions' ability to provide emergency response on site of any practice, competition, skill instruction or conditioning session.

In addition, by requiring all coaches to be certified, the compliance officers will be better able to monitor when someone is available to assist student-athletes in an emergency.

Proposal No. 15 provides for a minimal emergency care response that will enhance student-athlete well-being on our campuses. For this reason and for the reasons previously stated, I strongly urge you to support this proposal.

Scott Unruh (University of Nebraska at Kearney): I speak against this proposal. There are a number of reasons why.

I don't think anybody here or associated with athletics would disagree or not be in support of athlete well-being, especially on the medical front. However, we're not real sure that this legislation ensures that. I have four points or so that I would like to bring up.

Is this really a legislative matter? There is current policy. The question-and-answer handout that was provided suggests reference to the NCAA Sports Medicine Handbook as a reference for some of the support. To quote the Sports Medicine Handbook: "Each scheduled practice or contest of an institution-sponsored intercollegiate athletics event, as well as out-of-season practices and skill sessions should include emergency plans. Components of such a plan should include the presence of a person qualified and delegated to render emergency care to a stricken participant; the presence or a planned access to a physician for prompt medical evaluation if a situation is warranted; planned access to early defibrillation; all necessary emergency equipment should be at the site or quickly accessible; and certification and cardiopulmonary resuscitation techniques, first aid and prevention of disease transmission should be required for all athletics personnel associated with practices, competitions, skill instruction and strength conditioning. New staff engaged in these activities should comply with these rules within six months of employment."

Is this really a legislative matter? We currently have policy in place through the Sports Medicine Handbook that demonstrates a standard of care. If we are operating within that standard of care, there is already policy in place that moves us to this. We should be in compliance or working toward that compliance with that policy.

If it is legislative, then what would be the punishment? What happens if we find that a coach or an assistant coach is not trained? Do they not coach for a while? What is the response to that?

By doing this are we providing a false sense of security? Although we may have individuals in place with certification and whatnot, we know that cardiopulmonary resuscitation is only a temporary thing. Until we can defibrillate and do some things to make this a permanent situation, it's only a standby environment.

Who is responsible for making sure this equipment is at every site? There are schools that practice off site and sites away from campus and whatnot.

Are we creating an environment that is providing medical care that is not done by quality personnel, such as athletic trainers and whatnot? Are we assuming that we have people there to cover it and don't have to worry about having quality medical personnel at the place?

There are the logistics of training all these individuals. For example, graduate assistants and volunteer coaches. Keeping track of that is a logistic issue.

Finally, I would say we are all in support of athlete well-being, athlete care and medical care. We're just not sure that legislating this issue is the answer to it. Thank you.

Robert Boerigter (Northwest Missouri State University): I speak in opposition to this legislation.

Although I believe the intent is very noble, from my view it's to make sure that we have appropriately trained first-responders present at each of our practices. This measure goes too far. It takes this legislative issue, which is really a medical safeguard issue, and turns it into a compliance issue.

I can see football practice next fall. It's opening day and we have 100 players. There are three certified train-

ers and seven or eight full- or part-time coaches who are all certified in first aid. Then there's one graduate assistant who just arrived on our campus hoping to start his professional career as a graduate student and assistant coach who is not certified in first aid. As he takes the field, we are now in noncompliance.

It seems to me that we need to take a close look at this because of the word "all" that has been included in the legislation.

We remain committed to providing medical safeguards that are appropriate on our campus, but we will vote "no" against this legislation and urge others to do so as well.

Matthew McDougall (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II SAAC supports Proposal No. 15.

This proposal addresses one of Division II's priorities of maintaining student-athlete well-being. An implementation of this proposal reaffirms that the health and safety of student-athletes is of primary concern.

With limited budgets, it is not always possible to have training staff at each individual practice, but a coach is always present.

Further, while we recognize the costs and time required for training, we believe that if all coaches are certified, the safety of our practice and competition sites will increase. After all, the cost of even a single student-athlete's life is priceless.

Division II SAAC encourages you to support this legislation.

Daniel Bradley (Fairmont State University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I speak in support of Proposal 15.

As previously stated, ensuring emergency response and the care of our student-athletes are paramount. Today's financial climate places constraints on the addition of medical staff for every practice, competition, skill instruction, and strength and conditioning session across all of our sports.

Leveraging our coaching staff to supplement the emergency care response with CPR training and AED use will enhance our ability to ensure minimal emergency response plans.

The health and safety principle of the NCAA constitution provides that it is the responsibility of each member institution to protect the health of and provide a safe environment for each of its participating student-athletes.

This proposal identifies our emergency preparedness as a priority of this health and safety principle. For these reasons, I urge you to vote in support of this proposal. Thank you.

Mr. Ambrose: We're going to move to a roll-call vote on Proposal 15.

[Proposal No. 15 was defeated, 127-127-1.]

The motion fails. A tie constitutes a failed motion. It has to be a majority.

AMATEURISM — INVOLVEMENT WITH PROFESSIONAL TEAMS — TRYOUT AFTER ENROLLMENT

We are now ready for Proposal No. 16. This is a roll-call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2007. Please refer to the green procedural issues document to reference the interpretation for the proposal that has been approved by the Management Council.

Duane Hopkins (Florida Southern College): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 16.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 16 amends the tryout after enrollment legislation to permit a student-athlete to try out with a professional team at any time outside the student-athlete's playing and practice season. This includes any time during the academic year outside of the championship and nonchampionship segments.

The proposal also allows student-athletes to receive actual and necessary expenses related to the tryout from a professional sports organization, provided the tryout does not exceed 48 hours.

This proposal will allow more student-athletes to take advantage of professional tryout opportunities during the academic year. It would also permit a student-athlete to have the benefit of a tryout during the greater por-

tion of the academic year and remove the financial burden that may prevent some student-athletes from taking advantage and participating in professional tryouts.

Proposal No. 16 will lend greater consistency to permissible tryout expenses in Division II, regardless of whether the tryout occurs before or after the individual's initial full-time collegiate enrollment.

For these reasons, I strongly urge your support for this proposal.

Robert Gamache (University of Massachusetts, Lowell): Proposal 16 goes against NCAA core values, especially those of Division II. If passed, it would allow student-athletes to be compensated for professional tryouts during the academic year. The model of the amateur in sport has always been a cornerstone of the NCAA.

President Myles Brand has authorized the creation of a centralized amateur certification process. Why? Quoting the NCAA, the creation was, "in response to the NCAA membership's concern about amateurism issues." Thus, it appears that Proposal 16 goes against the concerns of the NCAA membership.

Passing Proposal 16 would also do more damage. Allowing student-athletes to participate in professional tryouts during the academic year sends a poor message. One of our new brands in Division II is balance between academics and athletics. Notice that academics come first. Passing Proposal 16 would be a dis-service to our mission.

This proposal would tempt more students to professional involvement. More time out of class means grades will drop and graduation rates will be lower. This would also open the door to professional sports teams trying out and signing players to fill short-term needs then releasing the players after a few weeks or months.

Let's look at the numbers. Only 3.5 percent of all student-athletes — that's Divisions I, II and III — go on to professional careers, and most of these are in the minor leagues. Division II numbers are going to be much smaller. Also, players with no college degree have far less bargaining power compared with college graduates.

Think seriously about student-athlete well-being before you vote. For every student who this proposal could help, dozens would be hurt. The faculty athletics representatives of the Northeast-10 strongly oppose Proposal 16.

David Riggins (Mars Hill College): On behalf of the Legislation Committee and the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal 16.

As previously stated, this legislation will ensure that Division II will provide a greater level of consistency to a student-athlete's participation in professional tryouts. The proposal would permit a student-athlete to try out with a professional team at any time outside the student-athlete's playing and practice season, and allow the student-athlete to receive actual and necessary expenses related to the tryout from a professional sports organization as long as the tryout does not exceed the 48-hour limitation.

This proposal is consistent with how we treat other students and student-athletes. We would never consider prohibiting a student-athlete from attending an interview at a medical school, a law school or an interview with a corporation. Why would we consider preventing him from an interview with professional athletics?

I ask that you support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 16 was adopted, 187-68-3.]

RECRUITING, ELIGIBILITY AND FINANCIAL AID — HEARING OPPORTUNITY — POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal 17 is moot due to the passage of Proposal 10. Proposal No. 18 is a paddle vote with an effective date of August 1, 2007.

Mark Linder (Missouri Western State University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 18.

[The motion was seconded.]

Under current legislation, the student-athlete has a right to a hearing when denied written permission to be contacted by another institution, denied the one-time transfer exception or when their financial aid is reduced or canceled.

Institutions must have reasonable procedures for a prompt hearing. However, this requirement is nondescript and leaves the student-athlete questioning the timing in which the hearing must be provided.

Proposal 18 furthers the student-athlete well-being philosophy by requiring institutions to include a copy of the established policies and procedures for conducting the required hearing, and when notification is provided to the student-athlete. The policies and procedures must include the deadline by which a student-athlete must request such a hearing.

The proposal also states that the institution shall conduct the hearing within 30 calendar days of receiving the student-athlete's request.

This proposal will improve communication of important information, will reduce confusion and increase the efficiency of requested hearings.

I strongly urge your support of Proposal 18.

[Proposal No. 18 was adopted.]

ELIGIBILITY AND PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — DEFINITION AND APPLICATIONS — INTERCOLLEGIATE COMPETITION — EXEMPTIONS — FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFER STUDENTS — CLUB TEAM PARTICIPATION

Mr. Ambrose: We're now ready for Proposal 19. This is a membership-sponsored proposal submitted by the California Collegiate Athletic Association and the Great Northwest Athletic Conference.

No one moves 19.

ELIGIBILITY — TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS — QUALIFIERS WITH NO PREVIOUS ATTENDANCE AT A FOUR-YEAR COLLEGIATE INSTITUTION

We are ready for Proposal No. 20. Proposal No. 20 is a paddle vote with an effective date of August 1, 2007.

John Meisel (Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville): On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee and the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 20.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 20 creates more flexibility for two-year college transfer students who are certified as qualifiers by the initial-eligibility clearinghouse and specifies that they may be eligible for practice, competition and athletics aid after only one term at the two-year college, provided certain requirements are met.

To be eligible under this proposal, a two-year transfer student-athlete would be required to have been a qualifier, complete one full-time semester or quarter at a two-year college, obtain a minimum grade-point average of 2.0, and satisfactorily complete an average of 12 full-time semester or quarter hours of transferrable degree credit.

By adopting this proposal, Division II furthers the goals of the student-athlete well-being philosophy.

On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee and Management Council, I encourage your support for the proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 20 was adopted.]

ELIGIBILITY — TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS — CREDIT EARNED AT FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTION — PRIOR APPROVAL

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 21 is a paddle vote with an effective date of August 1, 2007.

Deborah Chin (University of New Haven): On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee and the Management Council, I move Proposal 21.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 21 permits an institution to certify the eligibility of a two-year college transfer who attended a two-year collegiate institution, and before regular enrollment at the four-year institution as a part-time student.

In addition, the acceptance of the approved hours must be in accordance with the transfer policies and pro-

cedures by both the two-year college and the certifying institution.

By voting in support of this proposal, you will provide flexibility to the two-year college transfer students at the two- and four-year institutions.

Per the proposal, a student-athlete will have knowledge before enrolling in the classes of the four-year institution whether the credit hours are able to satisfy the credit-hour requirement of the two-year college transfer rule. This will eliminate the number of instances in which a student-athlete takes a course only to satisfy the two-year college transfer rule and later becomes aware that the credit hours earned in that course did not satisfy the requirement.

Also, a two-year institution will have the opportunity to inform and guide a student-athlete at the beginning of the transfer process. That will reduce the amount of time used in attempting to rectify any negative situations that may have occurred after the student-athlete has completed the credit hours.

Additionally, it assists with certain policies that prohibit a two-year college from placing four-year college credits on the two-year college transcript.

This proposal ensures that student-athletes are making satisfactory academic progress toward obtaining a degree from a Division II institution.

I strongly urge you to vote in support of this proposal.

Chairman Ambrose: Thank you.

Other speakers to Proposal 21?

[Proposal No. 21 was adopted.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — PLAYING SEASON REGULATIONS — WEEKLY HOUR LIMITATIONS — OUTSIDE OF PLAYING SEASON — INDIVIDUAL OR TEAM SKILL INSTRUCTION — SPORTS OTHER THAN FOOTBALL

Mr. Ambrose: Proposal No. 22 is a roll-call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2007. This is a membership-sponsored proposal submitted by the Sunshine State Conference and the Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association.

Michael Marcil (Sunshine State Conference): On behalf of the member institutions of the Sunshine State Conference and of the Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association, the cosponsors of Proposal No. 22, we have decided not to move Proposal No. 22.

Over the past several years, it has become apparent that our current skill instruction legislation should be revised. However, the SSC and the MIAA appreciate the leadership of the NCAA Division II Presidents Council and Management Council on this issue. We understand that the Management Council and the Division II Legislation Committee have been and will continue to work with faculty athletics representatives, athletics directors, senior woman administrators, coaches, Student-Athlete Advisory Committee members and conference commissioners to develop a skill-instruction proposal for the 2008 NCAA Convention.

Therefore, rather than moving Proposal No. 22, the member institutions of the SSC and MIAA encourage those efforts, and we look forward to seeing a skill-instruction proposal that will be developed for next year in Nashville. Thank you.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — PRESEASON PRACTICE — MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS

Mr. Ambrose: We are now ready for Proposal No. 23. Please refer to the green procedural issues document for the official interpretations approved by the Division II Management Council. Proposal No. 23 is a paddle vote with an effective date of August 1, 2007.

Daniel Mara (Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference): On behalf of the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports and the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 23.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 23 requires prospective student-athletes and student-athletes to undergo a medical examination administered or supervised by a physician before initial participation in any practice or out-of-season conditioning activities and requires an updated medical history each subsequent year before participation.

Currently, a physical examination is only required by legislation for student-athletes participating in football. However, before any prospective student-athlete or student-athlete begins participating in the rigors of organized sport, his or her health should be evaluated by qualified medical personnel.

Since college students typically attend school away from their parents and their personal physician, a medical examination at entry into the intercollegiate athletics program is warranted. All participants should have a medical examination before initial participation at the intercollegiate level. After the initial medical examination, an updated history should be performed annually. Further examinations are not believed to be necessary unless warranted by an updated history or the student-athlete's medical condition.

Per the proposal, these assessments need to be conducted not later than six months before participation. This allows institutions the flexibility to accommodate a large number of student-athletes arriving for the fall and spring semesters.

This proposal provides a minimal health assessment before actively participating in the rigors of sports and places an emphasis on student-athlete well-being.

For this reason and the reasons previously stated, I strongly urge your support for this proposal.

Phillip Quick (Concord University): I'd like a clarification as to the application of this toward tryouts and the time span allowed between the physical and activity and the request for the medical history.

Mr. Ambrose: Thank you. I'm going to allow staff to answer that question.

Stephanie Quigg (NCAA Staff): Based on the proposal and its language, it is a six-month time period that would be required for that prospective student-athlete or student-athlete participating in a tryout to have that medical exam or the updated medical history.

[Proposal No. 23 was adopted.]

WINDOW OF RECONSIDERATION

Mr. Ambrose: Congratulations. I hope, as we complete our voting agenda, that you've had as much fun as I have this morning. I appreciate your patience, your thoughtfulness and your civility in conversation about issues.

I'll now open the window of reconsideration for the proposals that we have just considered. Any delegate who voted on the prevailing side of a proposal may move for reconsideration.

[Note: There were no motions moved for reconsideration.]

The window of reconsideration is now closed.

CLOSING REMARKS

There will be no need to reconvene after lunch.

The floor is open for any general comments, questions about any actions of this Convention, the strategic positioning of Division II or any other issues that you want to bring to the floor.

Doug Echols (South Atlantic Conference): I'd like to thank you and others who worked so diligently on the new brand for Division II and the membership for the passage of Proposal No. 5. It's a very positive step for Division II. We'll continue to enhance our presence in our constituency groups and help to build Division II to the kind of model and opportunity for student-athletes that we all love and appreciate in intercollegiate athletics. Thank you very much.

Mr. Ambrose: Thank you. I think it's been a Convention that we can move forward together to do that.

Jeffrey Eisen (Mount Olive College): Can we get an update on the status of regionalization, the impact in terms of next year and which sports are being delayed? Can we get a status report?

Mr. Ambrose: Regionalization was considered by the Presidents Council. The principles that had been

worked through by the Management Council, working groups and the Championships Committee have been greatly appreciated and recognized. Many of those principles we're going to encourage during a one-year study before finalization of plans that perhaps can be implemented. We acknowledge concerns about their scheduling, especially in the sport of volleyball, and we're going to encourage those principles, sport specific, to continue so that there's not disruption on campuses.

We will work through the Championships Committee and staff. For those who have anticipated regional considerations in the plan that was put forth, we certainly want you to respond and react appropriately. Other ideas and considerations — dynamic and fluid changes that are happening within our membership — will be reconsidered by the Championships Committee and an advisory group to make certain as we move forward in this year that the best plan for Division II is put forward.

Mr. Eisen: Does that mean that at this time next year that volleyball is the only sport that will have the new regionalization?

Mr. Ambrose: I'm not saying that is the only sport.

Mr. Eisen: When will we get an edict on that?

Mr. Ambrose: We're certainly going to work on it. I'm looking at Mike Covone, the chair of the Championships Committee, as we move forward from this point. Communications will be open.

The committee meets the first week of February. Further clarification will be available after that time.

Mr. Eisen: Thank you.

James Watson (West Liberty State College): West Liberty State College is a member of the West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. We also are concerned about an 11th-hour notification that the clock would stop on regionalization. When it was announced and rolled out, there was a tremendous uplifting of morale for some of us who have felt that regionalization was very counterproductive to championship opportunities for our student-athletes. We announced this in good faith to our coaches. In some cases, the student-athletes picked up on it.

Now we must go back and carry this disappointing message. I think it's very counterproductive to the division. Dr. Ambrose, I appreciate all the work you've done. I would urge you, as chair, to do everything possible to bring this to quick resolution. Thank you.

Mr. Ambrose: I appreciate that, Jim. We certainly understand across our conferences the values of many of the principles that were contained within the plan — issues like contiguous states.

We have encouraged championships to take the elements that best serve us the most quickly and continue to find ways that we can use them immediately. But at the same time, we understand that there are issues and concerns among our members and some fluid dynamics that perhaps can be assisted by refinement of this plan that we considered would be in the best interests of the overall division.

Mr. Watson: Thank you, sir.

Roger Thomas (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I'm one of the guys who served on the Football Task Force.

The mission of the task force was a challenge from Division II membership due to the proposal a couple of years about the scholarship reduction in football. The task force came forward with a proposal that was defeated soundly today. That's okay.

But I don't think a lot of us want to operate in the future in the sport of football with the fear of what one side or the other side is thinking on a football issue. I want to go on record as saying, collectively, we have a great division and we have a great sport of football in our division.

I challenge you to think creatively and positively if scholarship reductions are off the table. What is it that we want to do collectively as a group to carry Division II forward in the sport of football? I want everybody to be challenged by that. We can certainly form another task force or whatever. But it would be great for our division if we could go forward in a unified sense.

We still have some of the same issues in football. We're kind of right back to where we started. I hope we can find some positive directions if those factors are off the table and go forward. I hope we think creatively for the future. Thank you.

Mr. Ambrose: Thank you, Roger, and all members of that task force. It is an important membership issue

that affects the entire division. We will work to find ways to make certain that this dialogue continues.

Barry Blizzard (West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): If we could return to the regionalization question one more time ...

You mentioned an advisory committee. Is that a committee, other than championships? Is it a new group? Can you clarify how the process will take place?

Mr. Ambrose: One of the points of the process that's been considered by the Presidents Council is to make certain that those conferences throughout this last reiteration of the development of the plan that were affected and perhaps had concerns had some representation.

At the same time, once you start reconsidering any part of the plan, it's a chess game. One move obviously affects everyone else.

Dr. Bernard Franklin and others are going to help us in the development of an advisory group to make sure that our ears are as wide open as they can be and to adjust that plan in ways that are best suited to all members.

We have not finalized membership of that advisory group to championships. Let me be clear. Championships has the delegated authority to reconsider within this moratorium and make adjustments to include the things that are good. The formation of an advisory group that allows for a heightened level of dialogue before we put something certain in place is important.

Mr. Blizzard: I appreciate that. As a friendly suggestion, I would suggest that in forming that group consideration be given for representation of all conferences.

Mr. Ambrose: Absolutely.

Mr. Blizzard: Thank you.

Steve Murray (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): I want to reiterate what Barry said. Division II commissioners have in the last year or so taken several proposals through the hierarchy and legislative process in Division II to have full representation on any review of regionalization and in the long run to the Championships Committee. That committee is so important to the future and the guiding principles of this division that full representation on the Championships Committee is crucial.

Mr. Ambrose: Thank you for that comment.

Steve, there's one other note to regionalization that has also been included in the Presidents Council discussions. There is going to be an appointment of a membership or division-wide task force on the consideration of membership. The task force will consider all of the challenges and pressures that are within Division III and the relationship between the NCAA and NAIA, and many of the tools that we're using to attract members to Division II.

As you know, we don't live in a static world. With all of that considered, that's one reason a year of study was considered to be a positive.

Joan McDermott (Metropolitan State College of Denver): As far as the sport of volleyball, I would encourage you to leave it with the moratorium and not wait another month. You're going to have a lot of coaches who are going to go over the edge in the next couple of days. It's probably not best to leave them in limbo for another month. If there's a moratorium, just do it with all the sports. I know there is a sense of urgency with volleyball, but if you make them change now and then there's another change in a year, that probably wouldn't be best for them. Thank you.

Mr. Ambrose: As it relates to specific sports, there will not be any scheduling changes. We'll work with and through the sports committees and with championships to make certain that they are positioned to know where they're headed and how championships will be played out.

I want to say a word to championships, particularly to Sharon Cessna. The regionalization philosophy is a grounding principle for Division II. All of these considerations diligently have been listened and responded to, especially on the part of the national office. I appreciate that work, both of the committee and the staff, very much.

Are there any other questions or comments?

I am proud to be in Division II. The issues that you are considering, the questions of regionalization, define us.

You've voted on membership issues today to make certain that members that join Division II are well-prepared and are going to be productive. Your voice today has been very productive and valuable in regard to what

it means to be a Division II member in deciding our forward movement. We heard that through the discussions on the proposals regarding scholarships and equivalencies. The voice of our Student-Athlete Advisory Committee is always strong and a defining point for us.

Our decisions have assisted a positioning platform that does bridge academic achievement and athletics competition. On each of your campuses, you challenge your student-athletes to get behind one another. The cumulative effect of that experience makes them a better person on your campus, but more particularly, empowers them to be better in life. That's what we're about.

We were very efficient today. You were very effective as a division in moving intercollegiate athletics forward for our institutions.

We've had a lot of help. Jill Willson, as chair of the Management Council, has worked very diligently on your behalf. All of our committees, and chairs and staff have worked hard for you.

I will suggest on all these issues — regionalization, positioning, all of the proposals — if there are means by which we can adjust and make improvements, we want to be at that position before we gather in 2008 in Nashville.

We are grateful for your participation. We look forward to an exciting year ahead for Division II. Thank you.
The business session is closed.

[The Division II business session was adjourned at 11:05 a.m.]

DIVISION III FORUM

SUNDAY, JANUARY 7, 2007

The Division III forum was called to order at 8:34 a.m. by Division III President Council Chair Ivory Nelson, president of Lincoln University (Pennsylvania).

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Nelson: Good morning. I'm Ivory Nelson, president of Lincoln University and chair of the Division III Presidents Council. Joining me on the dais are John Fry, president of Franklin & Marshall College, who also serves as vice chair of the Presidents Council and is our incoming chair of the Presidents Council; Michael Miranda, faculty athletics representative at Plattsburgh State University of New York Plattsburgh and chair of the Management Council; Debbie Lazorik, director of athletics at Marietta College; Dick Flynn, president of Springfield College; Leon Lunder, director of athletics at Carleton College; Heather Mathis, Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and Management Council member from Maryville College; Georgana Taggart, faculty athletics representative at the College of Mount St. Joseph, who serves as our parliamentarian; Dan Dutcher, NCAA vice president for Division III; Leah Nilsson, NCAA director of Division III; Jay Jones, director of membership services; and Matt Banker, associate director of membership services, who also serves as a Division III governance liaison. Jay and Matt will serve as our interpretive experts during our discussion of proposed legislation today and tomorrow. Also joining us is a court reporter to help create an accurate record of our meeting.

We will focus on four primary topics this morning. First, we will hear from Debbie Lazorik regarding her recent sabbatical that focused on integration. That project was supported by Division III and emerged as a result of the future of Division III discussions that occurred at last year's Convention. Second, Mike Miranda, Dick Flynn, Leon Lunder and Heather Mathis will lead a discussion regarding ethical athletics administration. Third, John Fry will update us regarding Division III membership issues, particularly the discussions of the Executive Committee Working Group on Membership Issues. We hope to be able to engage in some round table discussions regarding this topic. Finally, Leah and Matt will lead a review of the legislative proposals we will consider during tomorrow's business session.

We have refrained from distributing handouts. We want to save a few trees. The session will be presented in a Power Point format. The agenda and the Power Point also are available on the Division III Web site.

We are scheduled to adjourn at 11:30. Because we have a lot of ground to cover, we have not scheduled a formal break. I encourage you to limit your personal breaks as much as possible.

Our first issue relates to integration. This is a hot topic. It is important to better define what we mean by integration so we can better understand why it is important and how we can achieve it. To lead us on this topic is Debbie Lazorik, who has spent a great deal of time focusing on integration during the last six months.

INTEGRATION FORUM

Debbie Lazorik (Marietta College): I'll give you a quick project overview, a summary of the results of the on-campus discussions, and finally, several recommendations for next steps followed by a discussion of best practices.

In terms of this session's outcome, I think there's a little bit of something for everybody. As you listen to the results of the six weeks of campus visits, you might hear something new. You might affirm what you already know. Many of you might say, "Gosh, that sounds like my campus" or "that sounds like our coaches or our student-athletes." Finally, I hope the results of this project give us a lot of food for thought as we move forward and begin some action.

The project overview actually has been mentioned. This was my sabbatical project. The project's title "Integration—Education and Athletics, A Model for Success." That was an intentional title. I truly believe in order for our programs to be successful in terms of academics, sportsmanship, citizenship and winning more than

we lose, that our programs must be fully integrated into the campus community.

Why the topic of integration? First of all, it's a personal interest of mine. This marks my 30th year of working in intercollegiate athletics. We did a full athletics review process 18 months ago on our campus. The review process opened a wonderful window of opportunity to begin a campus wide discussion on the role of intercollegiate athletics that engaged our entire campus community.

We need to begin to broaden the way in which we think about integration and try to get ourselves out of the narrow view in which we look at it. Integration is not a new topic. Many of us have been to sessions about it and talked about it on campus. As we know, it's an integral part of our fundamental philosophy. If we need to be reminded of that fundamental principle, we passed legislation last year creating stronger language in our philosophy statement about the role of coaches. We've had 135 of our member institutions participate in the College Sports Project and also the Integration Institutes. That participation represents a continuation of NCAA best integration practices that began last year.

I want to make sure that I'm clear about the methodology used in this project. This truly was not a research project done in a scientific manner. The methodology of the project was to visit the schools that you see up on the slide. Those schools were chosen after consulting with the NCAA staff and represent the diversity of our membership: Private, public, independent, national liberal arts and two schools that participated in one of the College Sports Project Integration Institutes.

On each visit to these campuses, there was a lot of enthusiastic discussion and there was not one time that I was faced with blind stares of, "Well, how are we going to engage in this discussion?" There was a lot of enthusiasm about the visits.

On each of the campus visits, I met with four groups: coaches, student-athletes, an athletics administrator, and the person to whom athletics reports. In each of those sessions, we essentially covered four areas.

The first area we covered was the definition of integration. I think it's important for all of us to come up with common definition of integration.

Secondly, what does integration look like on your campus? This involved trying to take the definition of integration and bring it into the reality of our day to day lives.

Thirdly, what are the challenges and/or risks?

Finally, I asked about best practices. Then I asked another question: "What one thing would you do that you are not doing now that could contribute to integration on your campus?"

Given the time limits we have, you should know that the full report of my project will be submitted to the NCAA and be a part of its Web site. I'm going to take you as quickly as I can through a summary of the responses of the on campus discussions and then make sure that we have enough time to look at what was learned, what some of the recommendations were and what next steps can be taken.

First of all, how do we define integration? I presented four definitions to each of these groups and asked them to select the definition that best fit how they viewed integration. The answers from the majority of coaches, students, administrators and members of the NACWAA—I should mention that I attended the NACWAA, faculty athletics representative and student-athlete leadership national conventions—provided a clear consensus. They defined intercollegiate athletics as student-athletes, coaches and athletics administrators engaged in the life of the campus community that is an essential part of the campus culture and to the university mission. I also asked them what key words resonated with them. The two key words with this group were "engaged" and "essential." Those were very important to this group.

The faculty athletics reps chose the definition that was in a paper written by Bob Malekoff as part of the College Sports Project. To the faculty reps, integration is a deliberate effort to encourage academic, athletics and student life dimensions of the college and universities to work jointly in attempting to align athletics with the educational mission. The key piece for the faculty was the connection to the educational mission. That was a critical piece in terms of how they would look at defining integration.

The next piece has to do with the question: "What does integration look like on your campus?" I helped them to get started by saying: "If I spent one week on your campus, what would I see?"

Coaches tend to view integration largely in terms of a process or a function. Most coaches did not possess

a philosophical point of view, but rather defined integration as interacting with departments or individuals. Many times coaches responded by saying they had a faculty mentor program or that they attended a faculty meeting once a month. There was very little sense on my part that they really embraced integration as a part of their value system within their programs or as part of a philosophical base.

To summarize coaches' comments as to what integration looks like, one obvious answer clearly emerged: "We work with the admissions department." Others viewed integration in terms of recruitment and enrollment goals or working on a university committee or with academic support services.

Coaches see themselves as informal advisers. They do understand that they have a role to play in helping the student-athlete achieve academic goals. They see themselves as facilitators. Teaching or secondary duties makes them feel like they're a part of the campus. They did mention that it was important for some of them to interact with students outside of their teams or most importantly, to interact with students who are nonstudent-athletes. They saw that as part of the ways in which integration was occurring on their campus.

Student-athletes tend to view integration as participating in anything outside of their team activities. We should be pleased to hear that a consistent message from student-athletes was that academics are a priority. Sometimes academics slip along the way, but we do get that message that academics are a priority.

One message about how student-athletes see integration stood out to me. They saw integration in terms of how many people are in the stands. If the gymnasium or bleachers are filled with peers and faculty—they really love to see administrators at their games—it's some kind of symbol to them that there must be something going on at their campus. A real focus of their discussion about integration had to do with support.

Other student-athlete comments about how they see integration included that they see their peers or themselves being involved in the fine arts, study abroad or student government. They consistently said: "My coach stresses academics." When you try to get them to be specific of what you would actually see, a big response was: "I miss practice to go to class." If they miss practice to go to class, there must be some sense of academic priority. Other comments included: "Most of the time, faculty are supportive of my participation in sports. We need more people coming out to the games."

Every group I met said they really, really appreciate it when faculty members attend their games. Others think integration looks like the history professor who asks after class how the game was or how things are going with the team. They really acknowledged that aspect of integration. Seeing administrators, college presidents and senior administrators at a contest or acknowledging them as a student-athlete is something that's very special and does not go unnoticed. These are signs to them that something must be right.

Athletics administrators tend to view integration as a collaborative effort with academic units on campus. They see themselves as facilitators between athletics and in most cases really feel they have the responsibility to "lead the charge" for integration on their campus.

The athletics administrators that I talked to and other colleagues that I've talked with during this project begin to see leading the charge as a major part of their role and responsibility. Their comments included seeing the athletics director's presence across campus. Again, what is it we can see? This is critical. Coaches even mentioned this.

Coaches I think actually are beginning to appreciate the role that the athletics administrator plays on their presence on campus. Whether it's walking over to the coffee shop for a cup of coffee or whether it's making a formal presentation to the faculty or the trustees, they see this as a critical role, that there must be some type of physical, visible presence of the athletics director.

They see their role in relationship building as extremely important across campus. When we start talking about best practices, one of the consistent comments we heard was the importance of faculty or coach mentor programs. They said their role in initiating those programs was important.

Support from the president and the senior staff also is important to them. They see this as a high priority, not only support in terms of attending events—certainly that's important and we heard that message from our students—but more importantly, the public support that presidents and senior administrators give to the role of intercollegiate athletics on the campuses. The way I would personally describe it is that we don't apologize for athletics depending on the various constituencies that we talk with.

What do college and university administrators say it looks like? They tend to view integration as an expectation that the athletics director and student-athletes are held to the same standards as their peers. In talking with college and university administrators, what came to mind was the concept of “representation” that the College Sports Project talked about. The expectation that student-athletes represent our general student body clearly came through.

Administrators clearly recognize that there are a lot of student-athletes. The percentage of participation in intercollegiate athletics is apparent on many of our campuses. The role of the athletics director is critical in bridging these relationships with other areas of the campus community. Another thing that I find interesting is that many ADs said they don’t get many complaints from the faculty. If they don’t get many complaints from the faculty, I think that tells them that they’re doing a good job, that they must be integrated and that things must be going well. That summarizes response to that question.

The next question posed to these groups asked about challenges and/or risks. I think it’s human nature to take an opportunity like that to say what’s on your mind about the issues on your campus when it comes to the idea of integration.

Let’s first look at the coaches’ responses about challenges and risks. The immediate response was that integration is one sided. The first response out of one coach’s mouth was: “It’s forced. We feel forced. It’s one sided. If we weren’t doing it in athletics, we’re not sure anybody on the campus would do it. We don’t feel it’s reciprocal or that it’s a shared initiative. Athletics is seen as a deterrent from academics.”

The tendency is to focus on what I would call that small unit that I’m guessing almost all campuses have—a small group of academia that doesn’t understand the role and value of athletics. We tend to many times focus on that group.

A number of coaches said their campus would be just as happy if athletics would go away. In general, coaches have a sense of feeling undervalued in terms of the role that they play, particularly the role that they play in mentoring student-athletes.

There was a big, consistent theme through all groups: Time. Coaches asked when they were supposed to work on integration. They recruit student-athletes, retain them and coach them. They then start that cycle all over again. When are they supposed to integrate? The time factor clearly is a consistent theme.

Some coaches expressed frustration about a lack of internal integration. Their mindset was that they’ve got issues within their own department and they don’t even know what each other is doing. If they’re not integrated internally, how can they begin to set the tone for campus integration if they don’t feel that way about their own department?

Coaches also clearly feel that there is a greater expectation to win. I think this relates back to the issue of time and what their energies are focused on.

The last responses I’ll summarize struck me because it’s not something I was accustomed to, but this may resonate with some of you. The issue of physical separation was mentioned. For some of the campuses, the actual location of their facility is a real challenge to integration.

Student-athletes also commented about the issue of finding time. The general sentiment was: “We are always in season. If I’m not playing and practicing, I have fund-raising obligations. I’m expected to excel academically. I’m expected to do community service.” They believe in integration in that there are a lot of neat things going on around their campus, but they’re not sure when they’re going to find time to fit them in.

They also commented about the issue of publicity; that they need more recognition and more publicity across campus for what they do.

Another issue is missed class time. Some student-athletes commented that faculty response to missed class was inconsistent. If you had a room of 20 student-athletes, an athlete on this side of the room says: “Gosh, I’ve never had a problem, my faculty has always worked with me.” Another student-athlete says: “Well, that’s a real challenge to me because my experience has been much different.” And this is at the same institution. So they see a real challenge about the issue of inconsistency in faculty’s response to missed class time.

As for athletics administrators, they see getting coaches to “buy in” to the bigger picture as a challenge. Many of us and our staffs probably have a wide array of experience. We may have what I refer to as the senior, “old

school” coaches who worked under a different model that saw them hunkered down in the office and in the building and figured out on their own how they were going to do all of this versus those who are now coming in to the profession and have heard a lot about this integration piece and the importance of it. Now, you are trying to blend those two and getting them and convincing them and helping them understand why this is important and how it truly does relate to their ability to succeed in their roles as coaches. How do we relate that to coaches to help them understand that this is real and that it will make a difference for you?

They don’t always see and understand the value of the athletic experience. I think this is coming more from the academic side. Faculty doesn’t understand the value in this.

I think as athletics administrators, many of us believe the benefits are great, but it requires time. It requires hard work and greater accountability. The colleagues I visited with clearly recognize that it takes time, it takes work, it takes effort. It doesn’t happen because we continually discuss it, and it doesn’t happen because we hope for it. They recognize there is a real challenge in the role of the athletics administrator.

College and university administrators see challenges depending on their own experiences on a college campus. The narrow view of coaches on some of these campuses has created “silos” and an “us versus them” attitude. Their concern is the challenge of coaches taking that narrow view and not being able to understand the bigger picture.

They recognize the issue of time, but I found interesting in talking to college and university administrators versus coaches and those of us working directly in athletics is when they talked about time, they were very specific: It was games, travel and particularly postseason versus what are they doing out of season and what other types of mandates do we have for student-athletes in terms of their commitment to their teams? They recognize what I would call the pragmatic aspects of the student-athlete’s life.

Challenges for faculty athletics representatives include a view that coaches are not legitimate members of the faculty. This question came up in a discussion I was involved in yesterday. We could spend a lot of time on this one challenge, but faculty members recognize it. On many campuses you have to ask them what is their role? Are they faculty? Are they administrators? Are they on nine-month contracts, 10-month contracts, 12-month contracts? Where is their fit within the academic unit of the institution?

Faculty athletics reps also acknowledge that there is a lack of consistency about how they deal with missed class time, and that makes them uncomfortable that there isn’t a consistent policy or a means by which to deal with it.

But the one issue they really, really spent some time on was this whole lack of education on the value of athletics and its contribution to the institution’s mission. This was one issue that they really focused on; that it needs to be made clear how intercollegiate athletics contributes to the overall educational mission of the institution. The faculty group I met with at the faculty athletics rep conference clearly said that on their campuses there’s still a disconnect about the value of intercollegiate athletics.

Now, for the most important part. That was a summary of what I heard. What are some of the things we can learn? Again, these are things that I derived after reading all of the material and responses of what we might be able to learn from this project.

First, the old model is gone. Maybe what I ought to say is that the old model is the exception. I had a fairly lengthy conversation with a few folks about this yesterday. I probably am showing my years in athletics, but what I mean by the old model is the old Division III model—the teacher-coach. If there are any faculty athletics reps here, I thought Cedric Dempsey made a great presentation. He talked about the five major influences on intercollegiate athletics over the last 50 years. As I was listening to his presentation, having spent 30 years in athletics, I thought we didn’t have to go back 50 because a lot of these things have been happening more recently. But his first major influence was the model of the teacher-coach and that athletics was a part of the physical education department and in most cases the coach was a faculty member teaching in physical education. Probably in the mid 1980s, we began to see that shift. I began to reflect on my time in athletics, the mid ‘80s and his comments.

Many of us have eliminated our physical education majors. Many of us have done away with the requirements of physical education. What that began to create was a shift of who we were hiring. We weren’t hiring teacher-

coaches. We started to look more for the coaching background versus your ability to contribute to the educational unit that we were connected as a part of the physical education department. When we lost departments or we lost that true faculty status, there was a natural shift away from the academic side. Coaches began to be viewed as technicians. Again, I'm reflecting on some of the things that Cedric Dempsey shared.

If you actually have ever looked at your institutional budget—I don't mean the athletics department; take a look at your institutional budget—find where athletics fits. I would guess that some of them fit under auxiliary services. If you ask us, some of us say that we work in the service component. We offer some activity courses and things. We provide a service versus the part that is really ingrained in the educational piece.

Reflecting back on this whole model shift, I think something that clearly began to emerge in the discussions with various campuses is a true understanding what our role is. If we're no longer in a formal way connected with the educational unit on our campus, then how are we going to mesh and integrate?

I can remember when we went through a lengthy discussion about going to the automatic-qualifier system. It whet our appetites for championships. Access is greater, and with access being greater we want more. In order to have that one team get in because it won the conference championship and had a great experience, wouldn't it be good if another team or if in all three seasons we had one team? I think the AQ system has really whet—particularly with our coaches—the appetite for access in the road to championships.

I've already mentioned the consistent theme of time. What I'm hearing is we have more and more and more that we are expected to do, but our expectations to be successful have grown as well. How do we balance all of this?

I hoped one of the outcomes of the project would give us a broader view of integration. It clearly, clearly comes through. Integration is done in segments. I describe it as being very compartmentalized. We have a banquet at the end of the year to recognize the student-athletes and their academic and athletics accomplishments. We have an educational program on hazing. We have an event over here. It's very much compartmentalized. It's a very narrow view versus an institutional view, so it's almost programmatic and process oriented.

The role of the president and senior administration is critical. If I heard it once, I heard it many times, "it's got to start from the top; we can only do so much as athletics administrators and coaches." The tone has got to be set from the top. The president and our senior administrators must support integration and be able to articulate that same message.

Athletics administrators and coaches must be able to articulate the role of athletics and its contribution to the mission. We need to establish that vocabulary. Integration needs to be institutionalized.

What are the next steps? How do we get there? First, we have got to begin to think boldly. We need to be prepared to make tough decisions, and we need to enlist stronger leadership. The status quo is not going to move us in the direction of integration. There has been a lot of change in intercollegiate athletics. We have to face the reality of that change. Most importantly, what is going to be our response to that? I've got four recommendations. These recommendations are based on my years of experience and what I've learned through the project and what I've learned from my colleagues. I hope you don't start throwing things at me for some of these recommendations. They are recommendations that I hope give us some food for thought.

First, have the athletics director report directly to the president and/or serve on the president's cabinet. This addresses the issue of leadership and ensuring that there is a clear connection of the role of intercollegiate athletics to the educational mission. I would say the most important piece of that recommendation is the cabinet, not necessarily that the athletics director report directly to the president but that the athletics director needs to be at the table, needs to be a part of the conversations and around that table when those discussions are taking place.

Secondly, adopt legislation to further control recruiting. This addresses the issue that you hear from coaches. Think about recruiting 12 months a year, every day of the week, no limits on contacts, it's year round, it's summer, it's fall, it's spring, it's year round. I recommend legislation that further controls our recruiting.

Thirdly, eliminate the nontraditional segment in all sports. Truly give the student-athlete an off-season. I clearly heard from our student-athletes that they do not feel like they truly are ever out of season.

Fourthly, de-emphasize national championships and put the focus back on conference and regional competition. This would allow us to re-focus our energies on our educational mission and take some of the pressure off

of coaches and the pressure off of our resources. Take the pressure off of feeling like we need to continue to keep up with the Joneses, whether it's in recruitment or whether it's in our facilities or whether it's in our programs. Taking off that pressure hopefully would give a better and healthier perspective to our campus, to our coaches and our student-athletes.

I have to thank Nancy Delbay for helping me. Actually the word I used in my fourth recommendation was to "eliminate" national championships. They said you should use de-emphasize. But the term that Debbie reports here was to eliminate.

So, how do we get there? We need to start the conversations. Integration needs to be our umbrella. Integration needs to be on the checklist. We went to risk management sessions. I would say integration needs to be the first item on your checklist for risk management. It needs to be the umbrella. We need to make it our responsibility. You need to have the conversations, and we can't make excuses. We know things don't move swiftly on our campuses. We have got to have the will to act. We need to set expectations for coaches in their job descriptions, in their evaluations, in their hiring process. We need to model our behaviors. We need to inspire others on the campus. Convert the cynics. Convert those who are sitting on the fence about what we do in athletics. We need to be transparent. We need to measure. We need to answer the question: "Are we doing what we say we do?" We need to do it through data and through assessment programs. We need to develop strategies and challenge your management teams and your student-athletes. Believe me, they want to talk about it. I could have spent two days on your campuses. Create a professional development program internally.

Use resources that are available to us. We've got the College Sports Project. We've got our conferences to share information. We've got our NCAA self-study guides and assessment document. I've had wonderful conversations with many of you over the last day. We need to use the time we have together to begin talking and putting action plans in place and then the best practices.

The best practices will be a full report that I submit to the NCAA. It's hard to get into details of best practices, but I will be putting all of that in a full report. I took three from each of the groups—mentor coaches programs are very important; student-athletes really want to see something happening with greater communication; and athletics administrators want to find ways to integrate coaches in their roles on the campus. They have a lot of good ideas and so do our college and university administrators in terms of establishing some action steps.

At the end of the day for all of us, it truly is about the education of our student-athletes, about partnering with members of our college community. At the student-athlete leadership conference, I gave them a card to go with their nametags. On one side it said: "NCAA Division III Student Athlete." On the other side, it said: "Together is Better." Together is better. That's how we'll be able to move forward in all of this.

Finally, my special thanks to Marietta College President Jean Scott and our provost for their full support for having an administrator take a sabbatical. I'd also like to thank Dan Dutcher, and Bridget, who was on the staff at that time, certainly all of the participating schools—the administrators, coaches and athletes—that took the time to meet with me. I hope this has given all of us a lot of food for thought. (Applause.)

Mr. Nelson: Thank you, Debbie.

This information will be available online so you can have a full copy of the presentation. We hope that this has piqued your interest. This is a concept featured in our philosophy statement. We will look forward to the written summary of your findings to further integrate athletics into the campus educational structure.

ETHICS IN ATHLETICS ADMINISTRATION FORUM

Our next topic relates to the issue of ethics in athletics administration. I don't believe we have ever engaged in this discussion topic, but it certainly is important. Leading this discussion will be Mike Miranda, Dick Flynn, Leon Lunder and Heather Mathis.

Mike, will you start us off?

Mike Miranda (Plattsburgh State University of New York): Despite the topic and considering it's Sunday morning, it's not our intention to preach this morning. We have about 30 minutes to discuss ethical considerations in athletics administration. President Mosley gave me a good line to use. He told me that 30 minutes should

be enough because that's about how much time they spent on it in law school. So thank you, Jay.

As an Association and as Division III members, we commit ourselves to certain standards of conduct in a shared vision of the role of intercollegiate athletics in the educational mission of our institutions. That commitment is not without conflict, as you just heard. The philosophical can clash with the practical and the pursuit for excellence in one endeavor can diminish the likelihood of success in another.

While conflicts can be held to a minimum, institutions and the administrators, coaches and student-athletes who populate them inevitably are sometimes faced with difficult choices. How then are presidents, administrators, coaches and student-athletes to decide when faced with these choices? Establishing guiding principles that will give direction in such challenges is a key task for every institution. Each of the various constituent groups has a role to play in that process, but at each step along the way the analysis of the options and the clear understanding of the ethical dimension of those options can help us to reach that clarity.

Recent research suggests that student-athletes are somewhat lower in their moral reasoning skills than the general student population. Another study suggested that the emphasis on winning as the primary motive correlates negatively with high ethical standards. In other words, when asked to put on a scale what individuals value the most, those who said winning value ethical conduct the least.

I must pause here. As a librarian, I've committed a cardinal sin. I have references for these studies. I had a bibliography, but I forgot to bring it with me. If you want references to this research, please let me know after the session. I'll be happy to send them to you.

For those of us who are charged with ensuring that our athletics programs are firmly embedded in the educational fabric of the institution, these conflicts are and should be of great concern. As an Association, we have spent thousands of dollars over the last several years on various sportsmanship initiatives in the hopes of enhancing the character building qualities of participation in athletics. We have not spent as much time or effort in instilling a clearer sense of the ethical behavior among ourselves. The questions we are faced with are clear as are the conflicts:

- Is an action that is a clear contravention of the intent of a regulation but not explicitly prohibited by that regulation an ethical action?
- Is the pursuit of competitive advantage always justification for ethics that are questionable in and of themselves and that contradict the clear intent of a regulation?
- Can an association continue to thrive when each new rule inspires a host of activities to find a way around it?

To discuss these issues and some others, we have the panel that has been introduced: Leon Lunder, who is the athletics director at Carleton College; Dick Flynn, the president of Springfield College; and Heather Mathis from Maryville, representing the student-athletes.

I'm going to turn first to Leon for his remarks.

Leon Lunder (Carleton College): The field of ethics is also known as moral philosophy. It involves systematizing, defending and recommending concepts of right and wrong. We usually divide ethical theories into three general subject areas: Meta ethics, normative ethics and applicable ethics or the application of ethical behavior.

Meta ethics investigates our ethical principles from basically where they come from—religious beliefs, family values, organizational philosophies, cultural mores. It also investigates what they mean.

Normative ethics takes a more practical approach to arrive at moral standards that regulate right and wrong—things such as organizational philosophy or rules, playing rules of a game, the Golden Rule.

Applied ethics involves examining specific controversial issues by using conceptual tools that we have learned from meta ethics and normative ethics.

It is said that where morals are high, rules are unnecessary; and where morals are low, rules are unenforceable. Ethical behavior is not a sometime thing. It is doing the right thing every time so that we set an example for others to follow.

Playing by the rules is inherent in the field of athletics. To level the playing field is not realistic. We cannot legislate genetics, so we choose to legislate things such as lengths of seasons, the number of contests, types of recruiting contacts and enticements that are acceptable within the philosophical tenets of Division III. As a result, an ethical approach is consistent with what we should do in the NCAA.

When we propose legislation at the Convention, there is an intent statement included in the proposal. When this legislative proposal becomes part of the bylaws, the intent statement disappears. People can either take a literal or a philosophical approach to the interpretation. The NCAA membership services staff is extremely helpful in interpreting the legislation, but it requires the membership to ask. If you don't ask and don't tell, a more literal interpretation can often be used.

When this more literal interpretation is used, people may resort to their own interpretation of the legislation, thus adhering to the bylaw based on their own bias for it or against it. It is imperative that when we enact legislation or interpret bylaws, that we refer back to the Division III philosophy statement so that we are being consistent with establishing rules that are in line with what we believe.

We need to continually assess who and where we are in the continuum of athletics endeavor. Admittedly, Division III athletics has changed dramatically since the mid 1970s. Good or bad, it is what it is, and it would be very difficult to turn back the clock. Quality and quantity of experience are a motivating factor for attracting the best and the brightest students to our institutions. Athletics is but one of these experiences, yet it is very important to a segment of our student population.

Another issue that comes into play is student-athlete welfare. What a student-athlete wants, what a coach thinks a student-athlete wants, and what is really in the best interest of a student-athlete may vary greatly. The number one goal of any athletics program should be, and this is in my opinion, for the student-athlete to obtain a degree and become a contributing member of society. The skills of goal setting, planning, implementing the plan and learning to deal with outcomes in a constructive way are all valuable skills that can be learned through participation in athletics. Performing in a public forum under pressure is preparation for life after athletics.

While the pursuit of excellence is a noble endeavor, doing whatever is necessary to win championships is counter to the ethical value of sport. If enhancement of social skills is not an essential part of participation, then one could question the value of athletics in an educational environment. The ethical dilemma that faces us is whether the outcome of the game is more important than the impact of the endeavor on the student-athlete. Even the athletes themselves identify success with win-loss records. Being competitive, performing to the best of one's ability, making personal and group improvement, and having the opportunity to win on any given competitive date are the essence of a successful program. We can't control the outcome. We can only control our preparation and our effort. Winning is the result of a good process. Process is what coaching and teaching is all about. It is the pursuit of excellence that matters most, but not without regard to ethical behavior.

Clearly defining expectations of student-athletes, coaches and athletics administrators is the responsibility of the trustees at any institution. Behavior of the athletics administration is directly affected by the expectations of the central administration. Behavior of the coaches is directly affected by the expectations of the athletics administration. The behavior of the student-athletes is directly affected by the expectations of the coach.

As Aristotle said, we are what we repeatedly do. Excellence, therefore, is not an act but a habit.

I believe that ethical behavior is a key element of excellence. For us to benefit from athletics endeavor, we need to take an ethical approach. We need to fully understand the moral standard of conducting our programs within the scope of the Division III philosophy. We need to understand the intent of the rule and not seek ways to get around the wording or, for that matter, interpret the wording to match our behavior.

As an Association, we are charged to determine and clearly state our philosophy. As a member of the Association, we are charged to abide by the philosophy and to make ethical decisions that are in line with that philosophy.

Thank you for your time. Richard Flynn will speak next.

Richard Flynn (Springfield College): It's a pleasure to share the platform with Leon and Mike to discuss a topic that the three of us share an interest. It's also nice to hear the student-athlete perspective from Heather.

It's probably belaboring the obvious to say that there's no place for unethical behavior in intercollegiate sports. That really doesn't get us very far. How do we define unethical behavior or its converse, ethical behavior? Equally important, as Mike Miranda pointed out, how does an institution of higher learning establish and commit to certain standards of conduct for its athletics programs? Standards that help us make the difficult choices when our standards come in conflict with the win-at-all-cost mentality. We do get some help in defining our terms from Article 2 of the NCAA Constitution—Principles for Conduct of Intercollegiate Athletics.

Section 4 of Article 2 is entitled “The Principle of Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct.” In a manner of nine lines of type, it uses the following words: Character, integrity, respect, fairness, civility, honesty, responsibility, values and sportsmanship. I suggest that anyone who reads this section and still has definitional questions is perhaps disingenuous or a bit naive.

I think you will recognize almost immediately that above all, the president’s perspective on ethical behavior must be consistent with the AD’s perspective, the faculty athletics rep’s perspective, the coach’s perspective, and the student-athlete’s perspective, or should these positions and perspectives be listed in reverse order? It really shouldn’t make any difference if the common goal is consonance, harmony and shared understanding. That minimizes disagreements, promotes ethical behavior and makes the consequences of unethical behavior more or less obvious a foregone conclusion.

For several years, I had the opportunity to formally address attendees at the New Presidents Institute of the Council of Independent Colleges. My focus was on presidential leadership and, to some extent, why leaders succeed and why leaders fail. My personal observation, based on considerable research and a lot of anecdotal information, would suggest that a shortage of integrity often contributes to a leader’s failure, while an abundance of integrity usually assists a leader in being successful.

This notion of leading with integrity as part of the job has long been a topic of interest to me, and it’s really quite close to Leon’s comments about understanding the moral standard for conducting our programs. I doubt if there is a week that goes by that ADs and coaches don’t have to make some ethical decision regarding some part of their program. Leading with integrity can play an important part in this regard. I suspect that both Mike and Leon might agree that we can all benefit from standards of integrity that we can bring to bear as we consider a course of action for the issue at hand.

Mike has noted the importance of establishing guiding principles to ensure that athletics programs are, “firmly embedded in the educational fabric of the institution.” In fact, that’s one of the primary goals for any college or university president—to establish an environment that promotes, encourages and nurtures ethical behavior into the very souls of the institution in a way that makes it almost a knee-jerk reflex, not just in athletics but everywhere throughout the campus.

The president is perhaps in the best position to get this job done, to set the ethical tone to assure that ethical behavior takes precedence over other considerations. Compromising one’s ethics in pursuit of competitive advantage is not an acceptable trade-off, regardless of the individual’s, the team’s or the institution’s benefit. There is a growing number of corporate leaders resting behind bars today because they sought some type of competitive advantage without regard to any accepted standard of ethical behavior.

Of course, it’s essential that coaches and ADs participate in the ethical tone process setting, and it also helps if they are involved in the larger world of the academy. At Springfield College, like many of your institutions, our coaches are also members of the faculty with teaching, advising, coaching and committee responsibilities. Several have served on the faculty senate and many on the senate executive committee the past couple of years. The athletics director reports directly to my office and serves on the expanded cabinet and on the presidents council and on the deans council as well. I think that makes it easier to achieve the worthy goal that Mike Miranda identified in his introduction—integrating athletics interests into the prevailing culture of the college.

My advice to new presidents usually outlines the importance of hiring an athletics director whose values translate in to leading with integrity and who hires and expects coaches to share the same values. This will create an environment in which leading with, coaching with and teaching with integrity will clearly be the expectation and the norm, not the exception. This will assist in creating an environment where you will have an athletics administration, a coaching staff, and student-athletes who support, value and embrace the Division III philosophy.

To frame this discussion, allow me to take a slight risk and offer a real-life example from Springfield College. Our field hockey team is coached by an exceptional young woman who was an outstanding field hockey student-athlete while an undergraduate and NEWMAC’s coach of the year her first two seasons. The team won the league championship this fall on a Sunday, stopped for dinner on the way back to the campus, and then some members of the team decided to celebrate a bit more. There was no drunkenness, no rowdy behavior, no loud

noise. I'm not sure any of the student-athletes had any more than a sip of wine or a partial glass of beer.

The women self-reported to the coach the next morning. The coach pointed out the conditions of the contract that they had signed with her before the season began and suspended 13 players for one game for violating those conditions. That game, of course, was the first game of the NCAA Division III playoffs, for which we were serving as host. The suspended players were deeply disappointed but they attended the game. They stood there in the bleachers, in the driving rain, with their field hockey jackets on and cheered vigorously for their teammates, most of whom were jayvees who had only minimal, if any, playing time during the season. We lost that game 10 to 4. When it ended, if you were to look at the student-athletes standing in the bleachers, it was difficult to tell the difference between the rain drops and the tear drops. One's playing season is not supposed to end while standing in the bleachers, but for these young ladies it did.

How many coaches would have asked their players to sign such a contract in the first place? How many coaches would have made the tough decision to enforce such a contract for this relatively minor infraction rather than looking the other way? How many athletics directors and how many presidents would have ratified that decision, given the circumstance of hosting an NCAA tournament, or given the concern expressed by a number of the parents who are potential donors?

I might ask a couple of other questions as well: What message would the student-athletes take away if the coach had looked the other way? What message would the coach and/or the players have received if the AD or the president had not supported the coach's decision? These young women, collectively, are a wonderful group of student-athletes and human beings. They experienced a marvelous season and made a large number of good decisions; however, in this instance they made an error in judgment, but I have no doubt that they are going to benefit from the experience in the long run, as will their coach, their athletics director, their president, and their college as well.

It's a rather negative story in some respects, but in my mind it reflects a positive example of a coach and an athletics director who clearly did the right thing. The coach stood tall in making her decision. The athletics director backed the coach, the president fully supported both. The players understood and accepted the decision that was made.

I believe and many of our alumni agreed that the decision was the product of an environment that didn't permit any other outcome. It was the antithesis of the win-at-all-cost mentality.

After the season was over, I received a personal letter from the coach. She didn't have any idea that I was going to be part of this panel at the time. I want to share a few sentences:

"Dear President Flynn: I wanted to thank you for your support at the end of our season regarding the team violation and suspension of the players. It was a very heart-breaking incident and one I was so disappointed to see members of the field hockey team involved in; however, when the decision needed to be made as far as their consequences, I held true to the contract the players signed at the beginning of the season. It was a very difficult experience for me as a coach and former player in this program. What the players did was not an example of what Springfield College field hockey is all about; however, as difficult as it was for me, I was so fortunate to have the support of the administration."

The coach went on to say: "Thank you for your support all season long and for your kind words following the NCAA loss. Please know how much I value and appreciate your support. Integrity and ethics are so important to me in and this institution, and that's why so many of us love Springfield College as much as we do. I've had the chance to talk to some of the players individually, and those who have expressed their remorse have also demonstrated an understanding of what it means to do the right thing."

Perhaps you can see what I meant by making something positive out of a less than desirable situation.

In closing, let me suggest how vitally important it is for presidents and athletics administrators to present a completely united front when it comes to the ethical standards that are expected to influence the conduct of an institution's athletics program and remind you how important it is to discuss these standards and expectations with the coaches and make certain they, in turn, communicate, discuss and enforce them with their student-athletes.

No one of us is perfect. In the dark night of our souls, all of us wrestle with the ethics and the morality of

certain decisions we make as players, teachers, coaches, athletics administrators and, yes, as presidents. If, after all of our soul searching, our personal values are such that we made the decision that helps to establish a culture of compliance in which all individuals connected with the athletics programs embrace the philosophical understanding and underpinning of the rules and learn to operate beyond the mere letter of the rule, that is very much a result to be applauded and pointed to as an example of the way things ought to be and the way things can be not only in Division III intercollegiate athletics but athletics at all levels.

Thank you, very much. (Applause)

Heather Mathis (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Maryville College, Tennessee): As a student-athlete, I've been fortunate to attend several leadership conferences with many of our student-athletes, coaches and administrators. At these conferences, we address five practices of exemplary leaders. One of those practices is to role model the way.

Student athletes are told over and over to be mindful of decisions and actions because of the role they play in the community and on their campus. The best way I believe the student-athletes can succeed as being ethical decision-makers is to have coaches, faculty and administrators to help model the way.

On the other hand, I don't believe that it is solely on your shoulders because we all must take responsibility for our own actions. I want to share with you a couple of ways that student-athletes are doing this from the national SAAC level.

When reviewing the membership and governance proposal, we reflect and relate the Division III philosophy statement to our discussion. We also relate the philosophy statement and incorporate it in our discussions with our conferences, partner conferences and in our campuses. We take great pride in our Division III philosophy statement because it sets us apart. We are a unique division.

Another avenue where student-athletes are taking a stand is in our partnership with commissioners and their sportsmanship initiatives. We have developed a student-athlete friendly sportsmanship statement that we take great pride in.

These are just two examples of how student-athletes are taking a proactive role.

Now to the points already stated. On the story of the field hockey coach, the importance of a binding contract, whether verbal or written, shows that all actions have consequences, positive or negative. As a soccer student-athlete, I had a personal experience with this as well. My co-captain and our team had to decide that one of the members must sit out. At the time, it was a hard decision to make. It was supported by the coach. We learned from the experience and grew as a team by the end of the season. I believe that President Flynn would agree with me in saying hindsight is always 20/20.

The emphasis on winning was another point that was brought up. I think it's important when President Flynn said we are not a win-at-all-cost division that stresses that success is not necessarily measured in wins and losses, points and goals. It would be helpful to have reinforcement from coaches, faculty and administration to the students in that aspect.

I do want to leave you with one additional quote from the founder of my alma mater. Isaac Anderson said, "Do good on the largest possible scale."

Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Miranda: I want to thank the panelists and you for your time. The idea behind this was not necessarily to inspire great change at your campuses or to even suggest that great change is necessary at your campuses. By and large, we understand that our colleagues in the division do behave in an ethical manner and that it is only on those occasions when tough decisions are made that sometimes our emphasis falters.

We hope that this will enable you to begin a dialogue on your campus. Ethical behavior is not something that happens; it is something that you need to work at. You'll see on the tables there are the green sheets. There are some questions there that we hope will help you start the dialogue on your campus. Don't be concerned. It's not a quiz. We won't be grading it later on. It provides you with some thought-provoking questions that you might work on with your staff when you get back to campuses to develop a better understanding of what the expectations are for your athletics personnel, administrators, coaches and student-athletes. Again, thank you for your time. (Applause)

Mr. Nelson: I want to thank the panel for such an interesting discussion. Interestingly enough, I guess all of us have had some instances this year where we have had to deal with such matters. I'm sure you've heard about Lincoln University.

MEMBERSHIP STRUCTURE FORUM

Our next topic I'm sure we will find very interesting. It not only involves the Division III membership structure but also involves Division I and Division II.

As you will hear, after the referral of Proposal 12 at last year's Convention, the Executive Committee spent a good part of last year discussing the current NCAA and Division III membership structure. You can expect this issue to be a primary focus during the next two years.

We anticipate a chance for some discussion, so we have asked a Presidents Council, Management Council and Student-Athlete Advisory Committee member to sit at each table and serve as a facilitator and take notes if necessary.

To update you on this topic is John Fry, the vice chair and incoming president of the Council who has been directly involved in these discussions.

John Fry (Franklin & Marshall College): I want to brief you on what the Special Membership Committee has been doing over the last year in preparation for what will be the first of two years of public conversations regarding the future membership structure not only of Division III but of the entire NCAA. As you'll see, from an Association-wide standpoint, what happens in one division impacts others.

I want to focus on four topics: the Executive Committee Working Group on Membership Issues that just wrapped up its work; another Executive Committee group that will be appointed in the coming months to get started on its work for a two-year period through 2009; a corresponding Division III working group that will aid the Executive Committee working group; and next steps.

At your tables are questions that we would like you to wrestle through and provide us with information as we start this two-year process.

The Executive Committee Working Group on Membership Issues is the Executive Committee of the entire NCAA, not the Executive Committee of Division III. This group was formed largely in response to a 2006 proposal by the North Coast Athletic Conference to impose a cap on the size of Division III. The proposal has been re-submitted for 2007 as Proposal No. 11.

The North Coast Conference identified issues related to current and future membership growth, championships access, and access to the national office budget, programs and services. We owe a debt of gratitude to the North Coast Conference for putting this question on the table and pushing hard to have this issue discussed and resolved. Whether you are for Proposal 11 or the Presidents Council Proposals 10 and 9, it's important that we're going to discuss this issue in depth.

The Executive Committee also recognized significant short-term and long-term growth issues affecting both Division III and the Association as a whole. Their concern was that the adoption of a cap would leave Division II as the only viable option for institutions seeking NCAA membership. A related Division II concern regards recent or pending reclassification of Division II members to Division I. One of the themes running through this presentation is that this is going to be studied from an Association-wide perspective. What may be good and expedient for Division III but hurts Division II is not a good solution.

To make this even more complicated, we've noted the migration of many new members from the NAIA. Right now, the NAIA has about 283 members. Approximately 100 new members, mostly from the NAIA, have joined Division III since 1990.

So we have a three-dimensional problem to solve: There's pressure on Division III because of the huge growth in membership that has made it difficult to fit everyone in the tent; any action we would take has an impact on Division II, which has its own challenges and struggles; and the future of the NAIA and the possibility of continued migration. That framed our agenda over the last year as we looked at this whole issue.

The committee was chaired by Mike Adams, the president of the University of Georgia. Mike was a partic-

ularly good chair for this effort because before going to Georgia, he was president of a Division III school, Centre College in Kentucky. Also on the committee was me; Dale Knobel from Denison, who was a member of the Division III Presidents Council at that time; Kathryn Martin, the chancellor of the University of Minnesota, Duluth; Eddie Moore from Virginia State University, who is the vice chair of the Division II Presidents Council; James Netherton, Carson Newman College, which is a Division II school; and Rick Wells, a member of the Presidents Council today and chancellor of the University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh.

I'll first present our findings about Division II. Since 1985, 49 Division II members have reclassified to Division I-AA or I-AAA. Since 1997, 21 schools have done so, and several more are actively considering a move. There's migration from Division II to Division I. As a result, there's concern about Division II's size and scope.

Division II wishes to retain its identity as the sole alternative to Division I for awarding athletics aid. There's now debate within Division II about necessary commitments to athletics aid. A major vote at this Convention will be taken on creating football subdivisions to allow increased and reduced equivalency groupings. You also saw from the news this morning that Division II is looking at a marketing and branding project. There's a lot of change going on in Division II.

Division III has added approximately 100 active members since 1989. We are approaching a membership of more than 450 institutions, counting active, provisional and reclassifying schools. We have reached a practical limit in terms of our ability to provide membership services and championships access. This tent has simply gotten stretched too thin, and we need to address it in order to have a good future.

In the short term, the North Coast Conference resubmitted Proposal No. 11, and there are governance structure alternatives—Proposal Nos. 9 and 10—we'll consider tomorrow that will begin to address some of these pressures, but these are not long-term solutions.

Long term, we have very significant and fundamental issues to resolve. In my mind, the status quo of the way it is right now is not an alternative. It simply will not work for the reasons I've cited. So we began to think about how you go about the process of looking at what your alternatives are, knowing that we are going to have two years to wrestle with this issue.

We thought about the reform movement over the last several years, and we looked at recent voting on reform proposals that suggest significant philosophical differences within Division III. We also asked ourselves about the practical differences in athletics programs that also exist in Division III. The philosophical and the practical considerations are very revealing in terms of the data that I will show.

Regarding philosophical differences, we looked at proposals from the last three Conventions. There were 18 specific reform-related proposals that we used to gauge institutional and conference commitment to reform in Division III. We developed a composite score for each institutional vote cast that was consistent with the identified reform position. These measures only identify general attitudes. Of course those attitudes can change over time; but the measures provide insight into the way people are thinking about various philosophical issues regarding Division III.

This table shows the Convention Proposals. The first page shows proposals from 2004 regarding financial aid reporting; eliminating redshirting; the amendment to Proposal 57, the redshirting proposal; recruiting and admissions philosophy; student-athlete self release; reducing weeks and contests by 10 percent; playing seasons and the reduction in the number of weeks; elimination of all nontraditional contests; the limit of nontraditional segment length and games; elimination of out-of-season workouts with the coach/safety exception; and grandfathering aid for eight schools with Division I programs. These were all taken up in 2004.

In 2005, we looked at proposals regarding reinstating the safety exception in gymnastics and skill instruction in spring football.

In 2006, we looked at proposals to reinstate redshirting; strengthen redshirting; increase the minimum contest of sports used for sponsorship; increase sports sponsorship for schools with enrollment of 1,000; and the conference self-study.

Those are proposals we looked at to gauge institutional commitments to reform. This is the frequency distribution of the total reform commitment score. Basically, 17 or 18 is a perfect score in terms of the most reform minded. I'll summarize these, but on this table is the reform commitment score based on the number of proposals all the way down to three or fewer.

In terms of categories, institutions were divided into three categories based on their scores on this reform commitment index. The first category shows institutions that received between 13 and 18 points. This group contains the institutions that most likely want to join a division that is based on the reform principles of the 18 proposals outlined above. There are 130 institutions, or about 33 percent, that fell into this category.

In category two are those institutions scoring between eight and 12 points. This group includes institutions that would be the most difficult to predict their decision in terms of joining a reform-based division. There were about 35 percent in this category.

The final category shows scores of one to seven points. This group would be least likely to join a reform-based division. There are about 32 percent in this category.

We're pretty well split up. That reflects the nature of some conversations we've had over the last three years regarding reform. There's no surprise there, but it adds complexity in terms of grappling with what our alternatives will be.

The major issues that seem to separate the institutions in Category 1 from those in Category 2 are the following: Proposal 60, which reduced playing and practice seasons by 10 percent; Proposal 62, which eliminated all nontraditional contests; Proposal 5, which allowed skill instruction in spring football; and Proposal 4, which included participation before transfer in redshirt legislation. Those were the four hot ones.

Those were the philosophical issues. You can see we are divided philosophically at least in terms of looking at the last three years.

The practical differences are also another way of thinking about this. The goal is to help identify a practical method that could be used to subdivide Division III or create a new division based on standard criteria. We're looking for natural breaks in the distributions of these variables to help identify differences in commitment to athletics by these institutions.

These are the practical considerations. This table shows you various athletics programs in Division III based on their critical dimensions: number of sports sponsored; number of student-athletes; overall athletics expenditures; per capita athletics expenditures; and the proportion of student-athletes in the undergraduate population. This also is a real measure of the diversity of Division III. Take a look at the number of sports sponsored—10 to 35; the number of student-athletes, 100 to 1,000; athletics expenditures going from a quarter of a million dollars to \$6 million; per capita athletics expenditures, correspondingly, in a \$1,000 to \$15,000 range; the proportion of student-athletes in the undergraduate population, 5 to 50 percent. This is a remarkable range of institutions.

Sports sponsorship appears to be the most practical tool, in part because we saw some natural break points; but then there's a concentration of sponsorship around 10 to 12 in one area and about 18 to 21 in another. That's reflected in the table showing the distribution of total sports sponsored in Division III. You can see those two spikes in that range.

The distribution appears to have some natural break points. The first point is below 13 and the second is above 17 sports sponsored. That's one that we paid close attention to. It might be possible to use this variable to identify specific groupings of institutions for a new division or a subdivision, so this is one way of looking at it.

Sports sponsorship is practical but it's not an exclusive criteria. Over the next several years we'll be looking at all of these issues and criteria and trying to come up with an index that is more refined, and when combined with the philosophical considerations they'll give us something that really begins to break out these institutions.

From an Association-wide perspective, the Membership Task Force found that there would be significant challenges in forming a Division IV as one alternative or a subdivision of Division III as another alternative.

There may be other alternatives beyond those that would include the philosophical, practical or both criteria. There are complicated issues in attempting to maximize self selection as a basic principle that is fundamental to us. There's also the issue of how you fund this. Also, there's the issue of staffing and support. We get great support from Dan and Leah and their colleagues in the national office and we'll want to make sure we continue to enjoy that support for all of our institutions.

One of our recommendations calls for an Association-wide commitment to greater research, publicity and support regarding membership issues facing Divisions II and III. We need to face these issues head-on. It's time

to put the data out there, to have a transparent process, to have strong consultation with all the institutions involved and to try to wrestle these issues to the ground. The factor we need to consider long-term is what happens with the NAIA. Right now, they're independent, they're 283 institutions, but that is an external variable that we need to begin to prepare for.

The second recommendation is encouraging institutions to re-evaluate their current membership classifications with Division III as a viable option. There's strength in the number of institutions that go in to Division III. We don't want to harm Division II. Actions by other divisions—whether to control growth or govern continuing membership and reclassification—should not undermine Division II's viability. It's a very, very important principle to us.

We also need to explore how current Division I membership and reclassification criteria may be encouraging movement away from Division II and ways to slow reclassification.

Another recommendation is extending the current moratorium on accepting new members in Division III, pending continuing efforts by the Executive Committee study group. We have had the moratorium extended to 2008. It will likely then be extended to 2009.

We also need to continue discussions and expand the working group to include broader representation from each division. We also plan to develop some models for you to discuss at the 2008 Convention and then prepare proposals for the 2009 Convention.

So it's a two-year process. The first year will be devoted to study, looking at our alternatives and presenting them to you for reaction and feedback. The second year will entail taking that reaction and feedback, refining those proposals and bringing them forward to the membership for a vote.

I want to talk about the models that we kicked around at a high level in this group. The first was to create a Division IV using philosophical and practical differences of current members to distinguish more sharply these four divisions. Division I remains a division of large programs with athletics scholarships. Division II would house smaller programs with athletics scholarships and hopefully be more viable in terms of the numbers of members. Division III would have large programs in terms of sports sponsorship with no athletically related scholarships and be more restrictive in terms of the reform principles and the philosophy that I talked about. Division IV would be smaller programs with no athletically related scholarships and less restrictive in terms of its view of those philosophical criteria. Creating a Division IV is one model.

A second model might be to take Division III and subdivide it, using criteria similar to those described above related to the creation of a Division IV. In one part of the subdivision you would have large programs, no athletically related aid and have more restrictions. In another part of the Division III subdivision you would have smaller programs, no athletically related aid and fewer restrictions. There might be possibilities for others, but these are the two that we came up with and began to flesh out.

Then there's the issue of funding. There are a number of possibilities, and they're not mutually exclusive. The first is allocating an additional percentage of current Association funding to the division or the subdivision. I think that's a possibility. A second possibility is increasing membership dues to fund programming and championships. Our dues are a pretty good bargain right now. Third is establishing a self-funded division or subdivision in which members pay a greater share of their expenses; for example, for championships. Another possibility is adjusting an existing division's share of current funding on a per-capita basis as institutions might choose to migrate from one division to another. Maybe a combination of some of these will lead us forward. This is one of the questions that we would like you to wrestle with today.

My second topic is the new Executive Committee Working Group that will do its work over the next two years. Its charge will be to oversee the development of models and to address and resolve related Association-wide issues, including funding.

It will be an 11-member group—five from Division III and three each from Divisions I and II. The Division III members will be myself; John Nazarian, who is my colleague on the Presidents Council; Val Cushman, who is the incoming Management Council chair; Dick Strockbine, who is a former member of the Management Council and a member of the Membership and Championships Committee; and Kris Hall, who is a member of the Management Council and the Membership Committee, from Bard College.

From Division I, Dan Curran has been asked by Myles Brand to chair this effort and he has agreed to do so. He is the president of the University of Dayton. Other Division I members and Division II members are now being selected.

The Division III Working Group on Membership Issues also will be formed during this time. Their charge is going to be to work with the Executive Committee group in more of a hands-on, ground-level discussion to flesh out both the subdivision and the Division IV models and other models that we come up with. They'll serve as an advisory group primarily to the Division III Membership Committee, which in turn reports through our structure to the Management Council and eventually to the Presidents Council. We're not trying to create a separate structure over the next two years to go around what we normally do. We're going to follow the governance of Division III as it's laid out right now. Again, this will be a highly consultative process involving everyone. The members of this group gives us a nice representation of institutions and the roles and responsibilities they have at those institutions.

There are other active Division III committees that will be involved beyond these two. The Membership Committee will receive recommendations from the Division III Working Group. They will make formal recommendations to the Management Council. The Management Council will receive formal recommendations and make those to the Presidents Council as a part of their deliberations. The Presidents Council will make formal legislative recommendations to the Division III membership and then make formal policy recommendations to the Executive Committee and its working group regarding any other Association-wide issues that it has thoughts on.

As for next steps, the Executive Committee Working Group meetings will start this spring and run through the summer and probably the fall of 2007. The Division III Working Group meetings will run parallel and there will be interaction. A number of us will be ex officio on both. There will probably be a membership survey in early fall of 2007, then survey results and some preliminary models released for consideration in late fall of 2007. We'll then devote a fair amount of time at the 2008 Convention to take a look at the pros and the cons of those models and get your input on those.

Let's move to the discussion phase of this presentation. There are a number of questions at your table. We also have facilitators who will help move things along.

The first question is: "Which philosophical and practical criteria should the working groups consider to distinguish the new division or subdivision?" Philosophical examples are redshirting, playing-season length, non-traditional segment and postseason access. Practical examples also are listed.

The second question is: "Which funding source or sources would be most appropriate to help create a new division or subdivision?"

The third question is: "What is the appropriate target size for a new division or a subdivision? What's the minimum size? What's the maximum size?"

The last question is: "What basic national office services should be retained in any new division or subdivision?"

Thank you for your attention. In 30 minutes, we'll come back together and go to the next segment of the presentation.

[Note: Delegates participated in round-table restructuring discussions.]

Mr. Fry: The recorders at your tables will note your thoughts and give them to the Division III staff, which will summarize the information and use it as an important piece of information as we begin to take our next steps. Thank you for your input. You will have plenty of other chances for input going forward.

There was one question regarding whether voting on any of the proposals tomorrow might preclude us from going forward with this effort. There was a question about whether voting for Proposal No. 11, which is sponsored by the North Coast Conference would preclude this effort from going forward. The answer is "no." This effort is an NCAA-wide effort. It is going forward regardless of any legislation that we pass tomorrow.

I'll use that as a segue and introduce Ivory to talk to you about the last item on our agenda today. Thank you, again.

Mr. Nelson: Thanks for your thoughts and comments. Even with all the work of the Executive Committee on this particular issue, we still are at the beginning points of these discussions as a division. This is exciting work, but it will be very challenging. It will be important during the next two years to provide your input to the

governance structure and especially the working groups, Membership Committee, Management Council and Presidents Council. We really value your input.

It is now time to review our 14 legislative proposals. We want to be sure you have a good understanding of them going in to your conference meetings and before tomorrow's voting.

Jay and Matt will present this information.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FORUM

Matt Banker (NCAA Staff): Jay and I are going to walk through the 14 legislative proposals that will be up for adoption at tomorrow's business session. Before we get started with the presentation, there are a couple of housekeeping items to note. We're going to review proposals by topical category, not by numerical order, so we'll be jumping around in your Convention Official Notice. There are edits to the Official Notice on Pages 6 and 7 of your Convention Program. You can mark the edits in your Official Notice. Updated question-and-answer guides have been given to commissioners. If you want to see the most recent version, touch base with your commissioner over the next 24 hours. Finally, there is a document at your table that has voting and mootnicity issues that Jay and I will be referencing as we walk through the proposals.

We have broken out the proposals into these categories: health and safety; eligibility; playing and practice season; membership growth; and miscellaneous proposals. We're going to save some time at the end of this presentation to field any questions.

The first health and safety proposal is Proposal No. 2, which relates to sports-safety training provided by the governance structure, with an effective date of August 1, 2007. The proposal specifies that at least one individual certified in CPR, first aid and AED use and is familiar with your institution's emergency activation plan be present at each competition, practice and conditioning activity. The proposal does not require the purchase of an AED, although that is the best practice. You'll see that outlined in the NCAA Sports Medicine Handbook.

One question about this proposal has to do with the concept of being physically present. What does that actually mean? You need to have one individual who is certified in the immediate presence of the activity. An athletics trainer who is a phone call away and can be at an activity in a few minutes is not meeting the spirit of the proposal. You do need one person who is certified in those areas to be physically present at each activity. You should note that anyone can be that person as long as he or she is certified. The only individual who would not be allowed to be the person certified and designated at a particular activity is a student-athlete who is participating in the activity, the point being that he or she would not be in a position to monitor the activities of other student-athletes in practice and competition.

Proposal No. 3 also is in the health and safety category. This proposal is a common provision, which means that all three divisions are considering adopting it. This proposal requires medical examinations for all incoming first-time participants in intercollegiate athletics. The medical examination would have to occur within six months of a student-athlete's initial participation. The exam would need to be conducted by a physician trained in physical, cardiovascular and neurological areas. The effective date is August 1, 2007. This proposal also comes with the requirement that student-athletes who are returning and have previously received medical exams need to have an updated medical history. The updated medical history basically is a question-and-answer session that either your athletic trainer or other medical professional would walk through with student-athletes to ensure they have no symptoms or other health issues that may need additional medical attention.

The Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports is developing a template for an updated medical history form that would be available to the membership to use in conducting updated medical histories. Updated medical histories have a six-month window. Within six months of returning, student-athletes participating in practice or competition would need an updated medical history.

Moving into the eligibility category, we're going to look at Proposals 6 and 6-1 collectively. These are the male practice player eligibility proposals from the governance structure. The effective date is August 1, 2007.

Proposal No. 6 regulates the frequency that male practice players are used in three distinct areas: 1) male practice player participation would only occur during the traditional segment; 2) male practice players may only

participate in one practice per week; and 3) you can only use up to one-half of a starting unit in team sports of male practice players, rounding down. Using soccer as an example, with 11 being the starting unit for a soccer team, you could only use up to five male practice players in a women's soccer practice.

There are two proposals in the blue pages of your Official Notice that relate to male practice players. One—I-4—is an incorporation of an official interpretation that you will see on Page 39. The second is noncontroversial legislation NC 38.

Interpretation No. I-4 basically states that male practice players could be charged with a season of participation if they practice on or after what would have been their opportunity to compete for the women's team, and they would be charged with a season of participation in the men's equivalent sport. So if you have male practice players in the sport of women's basketball who practice on or after what would have been their first opportunity to compete for the women's team, they would be charged one season of participation in men's basketball. Again, this is the current standard.

Noncontroversial No. NC-38 has to do with the certification requirements of male practice players. Specifically, you have to go through the same exercise of signing compliance forms, ensuring that the male practice players have 10 semesters or 15 quarters left on their eligibility clock, and ensuring certification in the same way that you would do when certifying eligibility for any other student-athlete.

We point these two proposals out from the blue pages because there has been discussion and feedback the staff level has received about pulling these out for separate vote. That would have to occur when the business session agenda and program are voted on. At that time, these male practice player proposals would need to be both separated out and that would take a motion from the floor. So in terms of order, you may see these particular proposals first and then 6 and 6-1 later.

Proposal 6-1 would amend Proposal 6. As I mentioned, there are really three things going on with Proposal No. 6. One is that the male practice player usage is kept to the traditional segment, it's one practice per week and you can only use one-half of a starting unit in team sports. Proposal 6-1 would amend two of those three provisions. It's leaving alone the traditional segment portion but it's saying that you may practice up to three times per week with male practice players and that you may use a full starting unit.

Proposals 7 and 8 are seasons of participation proposals. The effective date of Proposal No. 7 is for participation that occurs on or after August 1, 2007. This is similar to a proposal we voted on at last year's Convention. This would say that the seasons of participation standard applies to participation at any—any being the key word here—collegiate institution, including independent, NAIA, NCCAA, junior college, foreign or other non Division III institutions.

If this were to be adopted, a Division II student-athlete who uses a season of participation per the Division III standard, even though they are registering under Division II standards in 2007 08 and then subsequently transfers to Division III, would walk in the door having already used a season for Division III purposes. This is going to require, in terms of the institutional certification, determining the student-athlete's use of a season of participation before transfer, asking about dates of the transfer, when they practiced, looking at practice logs, et cetera, from the previous institutions that particular student-athlete has attended. Again, retroactive is not a part of this. It's for participation that would have occurred at non-Division III institutions on or after August 1, 2007.

Proposal No. 8 also has to do with seasons of participation. It also has an effective date of August 1, 2007, for participation that occurs on or after August 1, 2007. This would allow student-athletes to practice in the non-traditional segment without using a season. Essentially, it keeps the season of participation standard solely on the traditional segment. The only way you could use a season of participation standard in the nontraditional segment is by competing on that one date of competition.

You should note that Proposals 7 and 8 could be adopted together—one does not “moot” the other. Proposal 7 would apply the season of participation standard to any non-Division III participant if they registered and would have triggered the rule at their school, and then keep the seasons of participation standard through Proposal No. 8, only to the traditional segment.

A student-athlete can participate in all fall nontraditional practices, skip the one date of competition and attend all practices before the first spring contest without being charged a season. That would be an example of a spring sport.

If Proposal 8 is adopted, you would have that student-athlete in baseball, for example, be able to practice without having that one date of competition come into the sequence of applying the seasons of participation standard. Competition during the nontraditional segment would be the only way in which the nontraditional segment factors in to using a season of participation.

I'll spend a little time on this particular slide because this actually lays out the current rule and what would happen with the seasons of participation standard if, in fact, Proposal No. 8 is adopted. You'll see on the left side of this particular slide, the current standard for fall sports is that the only way in which you avoid using a season is by practicing before the first traditional contest in the fall; anything subsequent to that would trigger the use of a season of participation.

If Proposal 8 is adopted, then that student-athlete would be able to practice before the traditional contest in the fall and then come back in the spring, assuming they did not trigger anything else in the traditional segment. Let's say they had quit, come back in the spring period and practiced again but did not compete in the nontraditional segment. They would not use a season of participation. So it would expand their opportunity to practice over the course of the entire academic year without triggering a season in that particular scenario.

In the second of these three, you'll see that spring sport student-athletes who have a nontraditional contest in the fall would be able to practice under the current rule before the first nontraditional contest without using a season; anything beyond that would trigger a season under the current standard. If this proposal is adopted, student-athletes participating in spring sports that use a nontraditional contest in the fall would be able to practice before that nontraditional contest in the fall and then continue to practice before the first traditional contest in the spring, thereby expanding their opportunity to practice.

Finally, for spring sport student-athletes in sports that do not use a nontraditional contest in the fall, both the current standard in which the entire nontraditional segment and before the first traditional contest in the spring, they're currently allowed to do that because they never would have an opportunity to compete because their team did not schedule a contest date in the nontraditional fall period. The proposed rule also would look similar at the entire nontraditional segment before the first traditional contest in the spring as the time period in which those student-athletes would be able to practice without triggering a season.

Jay Jones (NCAA Staff): Thanks, Matt.

I am going to talk about the two proposals that are related to the playing and practice seasons area. The first of those two proposals is Proposal No. 4. This proposal deals with the limitations on athletically related activity on the one date of competition in the nontraditional segment. This proposal really features two concepts that are meant to work in tandem. The first of those concepts is that a maximum of eight hours of athletically related activity may occur on the one date of competition for all participants. In addition, competition activity on the one date must be included in the eight-hour maximum.

In addition to that over-arching eight-hour time limit on the day of competition, there are limits related to actual competition limits. You see those defined within the proposal itself. Again, those concepts are meant to work in tandem. If you reference what Matt referred to as the peach sheet that's on your table—the mootnicity and parliamentary procedures sheet—you'll see that the sponsors of this particular proposal feel that those two sets of limitations are meant to work in tandem. The chair would rule any motions to separate the two out of order.

The other point to make on this particular proposal deals with the fact that these are institutional limits. The time limit is an institutional limit, so when you look at the competition limits, they relate to an institution. And by that, when you look at for instance 120 minutes, each minute that a team may spend in competition would count against that total of 120. You'll see in the final bullet that again relates back to the fact that certain activities such as transportation on this one date of competition would not count unless they met the definition of a countable activity. Okay?

Let's move along to the second of the playing and practice season proposals. Proposal No. 14 deals with the practice scrimmage and your exempted contest in the sport of basketball. Currently, the legislation allows for an institution to have two exempted practice scrimmages. This proposal would allow an institution to have an option. You could take the two exempted practice scrimmages that are currently allowed, or the institution could choose to participate in one practice scrimmage and one exhibition contest against either a Division I or Division II institution.

I'll turn it back over to Matt now.

Mr. Banker: The next three proposals we'll look at are 9, 10 and 11. These have to do with the membership growth issues that President Fry illustrated earlier. We'll reference the sheet with regard to pulling out items for separate consideration here in a moment.

Proposal No. 9 has to do with provisional and reclassifying membership application standards—specifically the maximum entering class size of four replaces the current standard of six. So what would be in place for provisional reclassifying institutions is that a maximum of four could only join in any one year, where the current standard is six. There is no limit on reclassifying institutions as well under the current standard. So that's reducing from six to four.

There's also compliance during the year immediately preceding application with all sport sponsorship requirements. A big difference between the current standard and what this proposal would do is basically require any incoming institution, whether it's provisional or reclassifying, to be applying Division III legislation at the moment they are in year one of the provisional process. The current standard requires those institutions to apply the Division III legislation in the first two years of the process to the greatest extent possible but does not require them to apply them as any other Division III active member would.

There are a few other elements to Proposal No. 9 to consider. There must be satisfactory completion of a viability statement describing the institution's commitment to the Division III philosophy statement that is outlined in Bylaw 20. There also must be sponsorship by an active Division III member. This can serve as a mentoring relationship of current active members to help support the transition for provisional members coming into Division III. Another requirement is a demonstration of a functioning compliance system.

Priorities are also in place in terms of priorities that Division III sees when they have perhaps more than four institutions that have gone through the process and are ready to move in to the division. These priorities include geographic location in an area that either needs or can accept new members; reclassifying versus provisional status, noting that reclassifying institutions perhaps would be in a better position since they have been NCAA members that would be coming from Division II, for example. Existing or potential membership in an active Division III conference obviously is seen as a very key component. A broad based sport sponsorship profile is another area in which priorities could be placed for incoming members.

As I mentioned, institutions are expected to be in full compliance at year one of the provisional process. That's a significant change under the current rule. Second, provisional members absorb the increased cost of the program and assure greater commitment to the membership through the higher fee, which is going to be increased to \$20,000 from \$12,000. Those would be picked up by the provisional members as the program itself has expanded.

Proposal No. 10 is another membership-related proposal that has to do more with active membership requirements. I call your attention to the sheet with regards to the voting and parliamentary issues and specifically some of the feedback we've heard about Section B of this particular proposal that outlines attendance requirements at both the Convention and NCAA regional rule seminars. There has been discussion of potentially separating that particular component of Proposal No. 10 out for separate vote. It could be done as long as the entire components of B are separated out for vote. What could not happen and would be ruled out of order is if, for instance, the regional rule seminar attendance requirement was trying to be pulled out for a vote on its own. That would be ruled out of order. The only way in which that area could be voted on separately is if the entire Section B was pulled out for separate vote.

So taking a look at the ingredients of Proposal No. 10, you will see the effective date is August 1, 2007, and the sport sponsorship audit shall be based on information reported as of the 2006-07 academic year moving forward.

As I mentioned, the Convention attendance requirement would be an annual requirement. The regional rules seminar attendance would be at least once every three years. We have regional rules seminars occurring twice in the spring—it's actually in May and in June for 2007—and there is funding through the conference grant program, specifically Tier 1 for compliance education. So there is funding resources within the Division III structure to help pay for the cost of attending these particular events.

Another piece of Proposal No. 10 has to do with the rules test. It specifically requires all head coaches and any individual on your staff who has compliance oversight duties to attempt the exam. There is no passing score of the exam. Another thing that we have noted at the staff level is a lot of feedback on how last year's exam went. We have received very good feedback in terms of perhaps structuring the exam depending on what position you hold or what sport you coach and tailor those questions accordingly.

There are a couple of other items to note with Proposal No. 10. Institutions placed on probation or in restricted status will be provided with a compliance assessment that is overseen by the Membership Committee. They are very actively involved in making sure both active and provisional members are staying in compliance and in touch with the Division III philosophy statement. The Membership Committee may respond with suggestions on improvements or recommendations on best practices to those institutions who would be in probation or restricted status.

I did mention the audit a moment ago. The Membership Committee shall audit the results and action plans of the Institutional Self Study Guides, again with the point being the Membership Committee could provide some feedback and best practices for those institutions in certain areas as specified.

Last but not least, the sport sponsorship audit component would have the Membership Committee perform an audit on institutionally submitted sport sponsorship information. That will be approximately five percent of Division III institutions annually, looking at things like the number of contests that the institution has submitted, ensuring that it does meet the sport sponsorship requirements, looking at your overall sports program, and making sure you have the requisite number of sports being sponsored at your particular institution. It's getting back to the concept of broad based program sponsorship and genuine sponsorship of the sport; that in fact you're fielding the teams and completing the contest as expected of all Division III members.

Another point as we walk through these three membership proposals is that they do not moot each other. In fact, if all three were moved and adopted, they could all work in conjunction with each other. I raise that again with Proposal No. 11. This is from the North Coast Athletic Conference. It would be effective immediately.

Division membership would be set for a maximum capacity of 459 institutions in Division III. The number was derived from a calculation of Division III institutions that were in place as of September 1, 2005. It includes active, provisional, exploratory members and any reclassifying institution as of June 1, 2006.

Based on institutions that have dropped out either of the active membership or provisional membership program, the current number of Division III institutions that include active, provisional, reclassifying and exploratory is 451. So right now there is room for eight spots for institutions to come in the door if this particular cap was to be adopted.

You'll notice that the moratorium that you remember from last year's Convention that was to be in place through this Convention has been extended through the 2008 Convention, so regardless of what happens with this particular proposal, there is a moratorium in effect through the 2008 NCAA Convention.

Mr. Jones: That leaves us with four additional proposals. These collectively fit in the other category so they're a little scattered in their content. The first is Proposal No. 1. This proposal deals with sports wagering and further defines sports wagering and who the legislation applies to and how it is applied. This proposal is really the result of the 2003 study that was done on sports wagering in collegiate athletics and the task forces that were formed subsequent to that. This particular proposal came from the working group that set out to look at the legislation and its application. This proposal cleans up and further defines what is sports wagering and who the NCAA legislation applies to.

Proposal No. 5 deals with tryouts. Proposal No. 5 simply prohibits an institution from hosting a tryout camp or clinic or combine that's devoted to testing the agility, strength and speed of prospects. This particular proposal's intent is to limit the combined type activities where a prospect would come to an institution's campus and go from station to station in testing type activities. The idea here is that the camps and clinics should focus on instruction. So there are a couple of points here that are made with the bullets. The first is that this proposal would not have any impact on an institution's ability to host a camp or clinic. We've also heard some questions about the ability to continue to rent a facility to an outside team and if they were conducting tryouts, is that still permissible? That would still be permissible. Again, the focus of this proposal is to limit the combined type

activities that are a pure testing type clinic that is taking place on the institution's campus.

So probably the most prominent question we get is: "Does this mean that our institution's camp or clinic can no longer have any testing?" That would not be the impact of this proposal if it were adopted; instead, what you would look at is whether that testing is a piece of the over-arching instructional component of that camp or clinic? For instance, if you had a baseball camp that ran a week long and on Monday you tested the velocity of a young man's arm and his pitch speed and then you worked with him through the week and on Friday you needed to test that again to see what change there may have been, if his mechanics improved and where we are now—again, that was used in the instructional aspect, that is not what this proposal is trying to limit or stop.

Proposal No. 12 deals with the sponsoring of future proposals. This does have an immediate effective date, so this would mean that proposals for the next year's Convention, the 2008 Convention, would need to meet the requirements if this particular proposal is adopted this year. The proposal would change the requirements from the eight current active members that are required to sponsor any proposals and resolutions to a requirement of 20 active members that would put forth a legislative proposal. It also changes the ability for conferences from one active and voting conference to two conferences. You can see, in both of those cases that represents a change from a collective voice of about two percent of the membership under the current structure to what would become about five percent of the membership.

Proposal No. 13 deals with the reinstatement request related to any violations that a student-athlete may have with the sports wagering legislation. The current legislation requires that not only the student serves a minimum one-year penalty for a violation of the sports wagering legislation, but that the institution cannot submit any reinstatement request until the end of that one-year penalty. This proposal would change the second part of that. There would still be a one-year penalty minimum for every student that was found in violation of a sports wagering legislation; however, this proposal would allow an institution to submit their reinstatement request prior to the end of that one year so that perhaps, for instance, if they were reinstated immediately upon completion of the year, on the 366th day they could be ready to go. So it really is meant to limit some of the bureaucracy of making the institution wait and, for instance, you could submit the reinstatement request in month nine or 10 or whenever you chose, actually, throughout the year.

That gets us through all of the 14 proposals and the comments that Matt and I felt were important to share with you. What we would now like to do is to open the floor for any questions. Before we do that, I would encourage and ask you to do one thing. When you are in your conference meetings and any questions arise, please take time to look through the question- and-answer document that Matt referenced. I want to publicly acknowledge the great work that Matt did. Our Division III membership services team was going through some transitioning and he was steadfast in producing what is an excellent resource of questions and answers that answers the lion's share of questions that we've gotten. I would also like to thank you for submitting some of those questions to us. A lot of the questions that we have in the question-and-answer document are simply ones that you've had and sent to us so that then we can share them with the collective body. I appreciate that from you as well.

With that, we'll open it up for questions that Matt and I will answer.

Kathleen DeBoer (American Volleyball Coaches Association): I have a question for you and based on your answer to that question would make a comment. Does procedure allow Proposals 6 and 6-1 to be tabled?

Mr. Banker: I'm going to refer to our parliamentarian, Georgana. I know there has been discussion of tabling or referring the issue back to the governance structure, but I will have her from a parliamentarian standpoint speak on that.

Georgana Taggart (College of Mount St. Joseph): That would be a motion to refer. The person making that motion would need to identify to what body the referral would be made. It requires a second and a majority vote. The motion to refer should be made at the time, not after we vote. It would have to be before the vote.

Ms. DeBoer: I know many of you are going into conference meetings this afternoon, and you have already had discussion about these. May I recommend that you look at tabling these two proposals? This issue is very, very high on emotion and very, very low on data at this point, which means that we know we have an issue but we don't know if we have a problem.

Having been part of the NCAA governance structure for over 20 years, I know that we are not at our best when we make legislation based on areas where we have emotion and not a lot of data. Divisions I and II are doing a fairly extensive study of the use of male practice players in all women's sports and the impact they have on coaching, athletes and participation opportunities. May I ask you to table this to look at this more broadly from a research and data standpoint and then decide whether this issue is causing problems and needs to be regulated and legislated.

Thank you.

Mr. Banker: All right. Thank you.

Marilyn Moore (State University College at Geneseo): I would like to get some clarification on Proposal No. 2 regarding first aid, CPR and AED training. Are we talking about the first aid that is incorporated into CPR and AED training, or are you talking about a separate 12- to 27-hour course that we would have to require our coaches or whoever else would be present at that practice to take?

Mr. Banker: Actually it would be either/or. It would be the former because I know when the recommendation came from the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, they identified that the ability to get certified can happen when you take all courses at one time. So you could take the course that allows you to get certified in first aid, CPR and AED use, which as I understand it is actually one course.

Ms. Moore: You wouldn't be allowed to just do CPR and AED training?

Mr. Banker: Correct. They would need to be certified in all three areas—first aid, CPR and AED use.

Ms. Moore: Thank you.

Albert Bean (University of Southern Maine): I would like to follow up on Proposal 2. I have a question about sports like cross country and golf.

In terms of a person being physically present, it's quite possible that at a cross country practice he or she may not be with the team throughout the duration of practice as they're running through the woods someplace. In golf, they could be on a separate section of the course with a group where you have other students maybe 10 holes away. I'm curious about the actual application of how that would happen with those sports.

Mr. Banker: This is included in the question-and-answer guide. The committee that initially recommended this legislation recognized those unique practice situations and said that in lieu of having someone who is in the immediate presence or physically present with cross country runners that your emergency activation plan expressly state what the protocol is for responding to emergencies for those student-athletes participating in those situations.

Mr. Jones: Are there any other questions?

Mr. Banker: I think we'll turn the microphone back to Ivory to share a few closing remarks.

Mr. Nelson: Thank you, very much.

Before we close this session, Ms. Donna Ledwin will make a special presentation from the floor.

Donna Ledwin (Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference): Thank you, Dr. Nelson.

I am the commissioner of the Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference. I also serve as the president of the Division III commissioners association. I appreciate a few moments to speak to this group.

We annually award a meritorious service award to an individual who we feel has provided exemplary service to NCAA Division III. In the past, that list of individuals has included commissioners, athletics directors and NCAA staff. This year, we're extremely proud to provide this award to a president. This year's recipient retired recently—Dr. Stanley Caine from Adrian College.

I did serve with him for a short while on the Management Council, but I think reading you a couple of quotes from nominations for him for this award from his peers describe his service far better than what I could say.

"He is an avid fan, but also a model of deportment, civility and sportsmanship. He remains current on all major issues, responds thoughtfully to proposed changes in rules and regulations, and has both the vision and the courage to champion the best in intercollegiate athletics.

"In addition, Dr. Caine is a tireless advocate for the student-athlete, a strong proponent of access to opportunity for athletics participation, and a spokesperson for the role athletics plays in the total education of our students.

“Furthermore, Stan has provided leadership for Division III student-athletes well beyond his school, Adrian College, and his own league, the Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association. This type of effort has strengthened the philosophy and action of Division III athletics.”

I can think of no more worthy individual than to present this award today than to Dr. Stanley Caine. (Applause)

Stan Caine (Adrian College): When you get to be my age, it’s nice to be recognized in any way, but this is a very special thing for me. Thank you, very much. You do a lot of things as a college president out of obligation, but my work with the NCAA became a labor of love during the last decade or so. I had the opportunity to work with a remarkable staff at the NCAA. I hope we all recognize how good Dan Dutcher is and how important he is in all that we do. (Applause)

I’ve had a chance to work with students, faculty, athletics administrators and other presidents to advocate for the Division III philosophy—integrating academics and athletics—so I feel like I’m among many friends. It’s wonderful to be back, and it’s a surprise to me.

Thank you, very much for this recognition, I do appreciate it. (Applause)

Mr. Nelson: Congratulations, and thank you.

We would like to make sure that the facilitators of the membership discussion bring your forms and make sure that they are given to our staff so we can collect information and use it in our decision-making as we move forward.

I want to thank our panelists today, our table facilitators and the delegates for your participation. I hope that this session provided information that will aid you in your discussions later today and our voting tomorrow. I also hope that we have better informed you regarding the important issues that we will face as a division during the coming years.

Thank you again for your attendance and participation this morning. We are adjourned.

[The Division III forum was adjourned at 11:34 a.m.]

DIVISION III BUSINESS SESSION

MONDAY, JANUARY 8, 2007

The Division III business session was called to order at 8:02 a.m. by Presidents Council Chair Ivory Nelson.

OPENING REMARKS

Ivory Nelson (Lincoln University, Pennsylvania): Good morning. Welcome to the Division III business session. I'm Ivory Nelson, president of Lincoln University and chair of the Division III Presidents Council. I will chair today's Division III business session.

Joining me on the dais today are: Michael Miranda, faculty athletics representative at Plattsburgh State University of New York, who chairs the Division III Management Council; Georgana Taggart, director of paralegal studies and faculty athletics representative at the College of Mount St. Joseph, who will serve as our parliamentarian; Dan Dutcher, who is vice president for Division III; Leah Nilsson, director of Division III; Jay Jones, director of membership services and Division III governance liaison; and Matt Banker, associate director of membership services.

Finally, our court reporter again is joining us today to help create an accurate record of our meeting, so please remember to give your name and school or conference affiliation if you speak at a microphone later today.

If you brought your cell phone or Blackberry with you, please cut them off. Thank you.

[Note: Voting procedures were explained to the delegates.]

CONSIDERATION OF OFFICIAL NOTICE AND CONVENTION PROGRAM

Our first order of business is to adopt the Convention Notice and Convention Program. We will vote on the proposals in the order they appear in those publications unless they are re-ordered. Please note that any re-ordering of proposals designated for roll-call vote also must occur via roll call.

By adopting the Notice and Program, you are adopting all of the appendixes found in the Convention Notice blue pages. This includes three legislative appendixes of note. First are the interpretations in Appendix B starting on page 37. Those interpretations will be incorporated into the Division III Manual. Second is a grouping of noncontroversial amendments in Appendix C, which starts on page 45. Third is Appendix D, which includes the modifications based on intent. They start on page 77. The amendments in these appendixes have been approved by the Management Council and Presidents Council and published in the legislative service database. We will not discuss any of them individually unless you ask to do so. If there is such a request, we then will vote to accept the rest of the package first by a majority paddle vote and then go back and discuss the individual proposals that were broken out for separate consideration. Incorporation is debatable and requires a majority paddle vote. Proposals removed from the package for separate discussion and not subsequently approved are automatically referred back to the Management Council for further consideration.

Is there a motion to adopt the Convention Notice and Program?

From the Floor: So moved.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Are there any motions to re-order?

[There was no response for the call to re-order proposals.]

Now that we have determined the order of proposals, are there any motions regarding any of the items in Appendixes B, C and D?

Edward Hegmann (University of Mary Washington): I don't understand the intent of No. 1-2—Recruiting—Sports Camps and Clinics—Privately Owned Camp—in Appendix B.

Many large camps employ prospective student-athletes after the ninth grade as counselors, cabin attendants, to work in the kitchen and so on. If I read this interpretation correctly, it says if that's the case, nobody from your institution can work at such a camp. I'm concerned about that.

Matt Banker (NCAA Staff): That particular incorporation is reflective of what's required for institutional camps. The Division III interpretative and legislative body said that the same requirement is held to institutional camps for athletics department personnel to participate and should be the same for private camps.

Mr. Hegmann: I hope there are other folks who realize that this interpretation is going to preclude a large number of staff members from your institution from being able to work at these large camps.

Mr. Nelson: I have been advised we should pull it out for separate discussion then.

Mr. Hegmann: I would like to move that.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Nelson: It has been moved and seconded that interpretation No. I-2 be pulled out for separate discussion. Are there any other requests? Hearing none, all those in favor of removing that item out for separate discussion, please indicate by a show of your paddles.

[The motion was approved.]

We will now move forward to accept the rest of the Program and the appendixes. We will come back to this (Interpretation No. I-2) for separate discussion. All those in favor of adopting the Convention Program, please indicate it by a show of your paddles.

[The Convention Program was adopted.]

We now will return to consider No. I-2. Matt, would you like to address it?

Mr. Banker: This is an incorporation. No. I-2 is an official interpretation that was issued by the Interpretations and Legislation Committee in 2006. It was reflective of the same expectations required of institutional camps. The committee sought consistency in the application of what athletics department personnel could do in terms of participating in privately owned camps as opposed to institutionally owned camps. I would be happy to field any questions about that particular proposal.

Mr. Hegmann: Did anyone on your committee consider the implications about the number of people who work at these large camps? I understand the desire for consistency, but I would argue that in this case it's going to be a burden.

Mr. Banker: The discussion held to if institutional personnel can participate in privately owned camps, there needs to be some reasonable criteria by which they do so. To hold them to less stringent criteria for camps that institutions don't oversee was a concern of the committee. So they said at the very least, the same requirements held. Again, it doesn't prohibit institutional personnel from participating in outside camps that are private. It's just saying that these are the criteria you must ensure you meet in terms of the three criteria in the interpretation.

In terms of reading what is actually happening with this incorporation of the interpretation requiring that you can only participate in privately owned camps in which prospects who have started the ninth grade and are not employed at that camp or clinic is the same expectation as an institutional camp. The camp or clinic shall be open to the general public. That's the same standard that's required of your institution's camps. The camp or clinic shall not give free or reduced admission privileges to a prospect who started the ninth grade.

It really goes back to a consistency issue. It doesn't prohibit athletics department personnel from being involved in privately owned camps. It makes the requirements consistent with what the schools have to do.

Mr. Hegmann: For you to say it doesn't prohibit them from working shows me clearly that you and the committee members don't understand how these large camps operate. These large camps employ high school students as camp counselors, cabin attendants, people who work in their dining hall and in their kitchen. I understand your need for legalese consistency, but you are now "X'ing out" an awful lot of people from working. You are prohibiting them from working because this is the way these large camps run. To say you're not prohibiting them is erroneous, I'm sorry.

Mr. Nelson: Are there any other comments on this issue? A vote to approve incorporates this into the Program. A "no" vote refers it back to the Management Council for interpretation. We'll now vote. Again, approving it incorporates the interpretation in today's agenda; nonapproval will refer it back to the Management Council.

[The motion to refer Interpretation No. 1-2 to the Management Council was approved.]

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INTRODUCTIONS

Permit me now to review today's agenda and timetable and make announcements.

[Note: The business session agenda was reviewed, the Convention Planning Subcommittee was introduced, outgoing members of the Presidents and Management Councils were recognized and commended for their work, committee members were recognized, the Presidents and Chancellors Advisory and Virtual Focus Groups were acknowledged and individuals from schools that hosted a championship were recognized.]

FINANCIAL AID REPORTING PROCESS

We are now ready to begin our discussion sessions. This first session will update you on our financial aid reporting process. Nothing could be more important to the division.

Matt Banker (NCAA Staff): Thank you, Ivory.

Again, I'm Matt Banker from the NCAA staff. Along with Eric Hartung from the NCAA research staff, we're going to walk through a presentation about the financial aid reporting process as we head through year two. But before we do so, we want to introduce our Financial Aid Committee members who are here to answer any questions. We're going to save time for questions from the floor to our committee and staff about the reporting process and some of the hot-button issues that have come up of late, et cetera.

We're going to start with our chair, Dan Preston, and work our way toward the middle and have them introduce themselves.

[Note: The Financial Aid Committee members introduced themselves.]

You'll notice that we have a pretty diverse committee in terms of perspectives brought to the table when they review your institution's financial aid report, your justifications, et cetera. We'll talk a more about that, but as you can see, we have athletics directors, we have a dean of enrollment, we have presidents and we have financial aid directors. That brings a very good pool of perspectives and backgrounds to the table as we review each institution's report.

Eric and I will highlight a few things through a PowerPoint presentation, and then we want to open the floor for any questions. We want to review the 2006-07 Level I reviews. As you may know, we're in the middle of the review process. We ended the Level I review this fall, and we are moving schools that are required to provide justifications for their financial aid variance into Level II. The Financial Aid Committee will look at those justifications next month at its in-person meeting. We'll look at variance estimates from last year's reporting process compared to this year's reporting process. We'll talk about points of emphasis and issues related to the financial aid and the reporting process itself because it's ever evolving. Again, we'll take questions and comments from the floor to get some insight from our Financial Aid Committee members.

Eric will talk about the statistical comparisons from the last couple of years within the reporting process.

Eric Hartung (NCAA Staff): Thank you, Matt. It's great to be here. I'm glad to see everyone here this morning.

I'm going to show some numbers. The slide on the screen reflects Level I reviews. These are the number of Level I cases and the proportion of cases that the committee has reviewed. In 2005-06, 60 cases or 13.9 percent of the membership was reviewed at Level I. You then see a spike in the number of cases reviewed at Level I in 2006-07, up to 91 institutions. The reason for that change in number is because we had schools that returned to the process from 2005-06 that were built into our processes and procedures by the committee. The outcomes would include an approval with conditions that may send a school forward to review in the subsequent year. The committee deemed that any enforcement referrals would be automatically reviewed in the subsequent year. So this does not mean that we have 91 new schools. This simply means that we reviewed 91 institutions, some of which are a carryover from 2005-06.

This slide shows you what the Level I review outcomes were. From a year ago, of the 60 institutions that were reviewed, 48 had justifications requested. That's 11 percent of the membership. In 2006-07, the breakdown looks a bit different. We have 30 institutions where justifications were requested. That's about seven percent of the membership.

The next slide is very important. It truly captures what we have done with the Financial Aid Reporting program over the years. Across two years, the Division III Financial Aid Committee has reviewed 99 institutions, or approximately 23 percent of the Division III membership. Nearly a quarter of the membership has had a close review of their financial aid reports.

Additionally, 75 cases, or approximately 17 percent of the membership, has been forwarded to a Level II review. This is a very important point. The Financial Aid Committee has in a responsible and systematic fashion reviewed the policies and procedures referring to the administration of financial aid at 75 institutions. This number will continue to increase as we move forward, but this is a sign that the committee has been successful and that the program that has been established has been successful in reviewing those policies in terms of compliance with NCAA Division III financial aid bylaws.

Let's go to the next couple of slides. If you remember from a year ago, the one trigger that we had to get you to a Level I review was the variance estimate. The variance estimate is a statistically based metric that tests the amount of institutional gift financial aid that a student-athlete would receive in comparison to another student-athlete or a nonstudent-athlete with similar financial need. A year ago, we had a negative 3.2 percent in the 50th percentile or the median of the distribution. For 2006-07, we have a negative 3.4. This shows that this metric is relatively consistent across years. Remember, this is aggregate information.

To show how the variance works out, a year ago we had 57 institutions that were above four percent. Four percent is the threshold that was set by the committee to enact a Level I review. That's 13.2 percent of the membership in 2005-06. In 2006-07, 14.7 percent were above four percent. That shows you the consistency in this metric.

I'll turn it back over to Matt.

Mr. Banker: Thank you, Eric.

There are a couple of points of emphasis. One is the connection between the admissions ratings forms or admissions matrixes that many institutions use and the financial aid packaging. Essentially, we're seeing over the course of the last year-and-a-half that the Financial Aid Committee has recognized the extent that Division III member institutions actually have their financial aid packaging based on some sort of admissions ranking or matrix score. Because admissions can consider athletics ability in terms of admitting students when it's tied ultimately to financial aid packaging, you can begin to see where the potential pitfall is from a compliance standpoint with regards to the financial aid legislation.

The second bullet point you see is really important from an athletics department staff member perspective and probably captures the most quintessential scenario on campus in which athletics coaches and department staffs are actually violating financial aid legislation. When you get the phone call from a prospective student-athlete who is saying another school is offering a better financial aid package, they know the coach is the number one person they have some sort of connection with to your campus. What happens when a prospect asks the coach to help improve the financial aid package at your school that may tip the decision in your institution's favor? Instead of having you pick up the phone to lobby your financial aid department for a better package, it would be appropriate for the coach to tell the prospective student or their parents that there may be some sort of appeal opportunity that is available to any other student to get a higher financial aid award. That would be appropriate.

Athletics ability, participation or performance may not be considered, regardless if tied to leadership or other scholarship or award category. This is the biggest issue we're now finding. The Financial Aid Committee will discuss this at its meeting next month. The issue boils down to this: Athletics leadership used as a financial aid packaging criteria ties both the concept of leadership with athletics. How can you carve out leadership as a separate entity when awarding financial aid when other prospective students exhibit leadership in other activities that don't involve athletics, like theater, music, et cetera?

It's going to be a challenge to carve out some sort of exception. We have received a lot of good feedback from the membership on potential ways to do this so that student-athletes and nonathletes are treated in a similar fashion. But we need to do so in a way that does not compromise the financial aid tenets that this division believes in—that you cannot create a loophole that athletics leadership allows for any type of athletics aid packaging.

The second bullet point illustrates the reporting process and includes a review of your institution's financial aid data and packaging policies. The Financial Aid Committee used to have the charge of reviewing the award policies at every institution's campus. The "award of circumstance" was the term of art we previously used in Division III. That only took a snapshot of part of the picture of what was going on. As Eric said, we have a statistical and policy review together, and that's more of a comprehensive review. That's one of the benefits that this reporting process has that previous processes that the Financial Aid Committee oversaw did not.

Eric mentioned the four-percent variance. That's the most identifiable statistical number with this reporting process; however, we should reiterate that that's not the legislation. You won't find that in the Manual. The four-percent variance triggers further review by the Financial Aid Committee. It may be that they want to ask questions of particular issues within your financial aid report based on the four-percent trigger, but just having a variance that's above four percent does not mean that you are in violation of Bylaw 15.

Another benefit we've seen is the increased dialogue about financial aid. Obviously, this is a high-profile issue with the reporting process, but it's also one of the most signature tenets of Division III. When people think about Division III, one of the first things they think about is that it's the division that doesn't offer athletics scholarships. So this is manifesting that particular philosophy.

Eric would tell you that additional years of data will only enhance this process. We're beginning to see trends, but we're only in year two. Before we make long-term conclusions about where this process is going, a couple more years is going to benefit the way in which the Financial Aid Committee reviews your institution's data.

There are a couple of points about confidentiality. The Financial Aid Committee at no point knows which institutions they are reviewing. Any information that includes institutional identification is stripped and removed from the review. The Financial Aid Committee and our staff's communications with your institution is the only type of communication that occurs that involves your financial aid data or your financial aid packaging policies. If your institution decides to share your variance information at the conference level, that would have to be up to your institution and conference. We only share the data with your institution only.

I have a couple of concluding points, and then we'll open the floor for questions and comments. This is the primary mechanism by which we evaluate compliance with financial aid. It's not the only method, but obviously it is the flagship method. The principle of no athletics aid is a fundamental tenet of the Division III philosophy statement. That's illustrated in Bylaw 20 of the Manual. Considering issues like athletics leadership, we have to keep in mind what we already expressly state what this division believes in.

The floor is open for questions.

Maybe we can start by having committee members comment on how the reporting process has progressed over the last year-and-a-half.

Dan Preston (Linfield College): I have a couple of comments about the process that the committee has gone through, the work that the staff has done in terms of the statistical analysis and the work that Eric Hartung and Ann Kuntz have done on the NCAA staff. It's important to note that they not only are working within the NCAA staff. Eric works with an outside statisticians group to check internal and external validity of the reporting process and the kinds of methods that we're going through. We've heard from that group a couple of times that the methods we're using to analyze the financial aid reporting information has some statistical validity to it that's very important to the committee. We've asked repeatedly about that, and we've checked on that a number of times.

Although we've been working on this reporting process since 2000—that was my first year working on the task group assigned to build this process—we're only one full year into it. The committee learned a lot from that first year. We appreciated the feedback from the schools involved in Level II reviews. We do see some issues before us, especially regarding leadership and athletics participation. How can we separate those two—if that's even possible—to allow schools to award leadership-based aid tied to athletics participation? That's a challenging issue to separate. We also have looked at the four-percent variance and how that works for schools. We also learned a lot from schools about who does the awarding and how we may need to modify the bylaws to accommodate the various ways schools award financial aid.

It isn't the committee's role and this reporting process to dictate how a school awards financial aid. The com-

mittee's responsibility and an institution's responsibility is to make sure that we don't use athletics participation or ability in distinguishing financial aid awards between athletes and other students. That's the role of this process and the responsibility of schools. We're not trying to legislate and write into bylaws how schools should award financial aid, but we do need to make sure that no matter how we award financial aid, that we follow the bylaws of not awarding financial aid based on athletics participation or ability.

Debra Townsley (Nichols College): I want to reiterate that our staff is incredible. The statistics they compiled have provided a very fair view of what people have sent us. I'm finishing my first year on the committee. I was involved in the Level II reviews last year. Even if you're over four percent, not everybody ended up having a problem because there are ways that schools differentiate their financial aid so that they'd end up over four percent. Some of the ways include if you have graduate versus undergraduate students and you award them, or residential versus commuter and you award them, and full-time versus part-time. The last one that we often note in these justifications is academics. If you truly are awarding on academics and your athletes are academically stronger, which schools last year did prove to us in their statistics, then that's acceptable, too. Those were the four areas that consistently came up in justifications for schools that were over four percent.

In addition, presidents should be involved in the responses. We saw schools last year that gave responses, and presidents weren't involved at any level of the process. When a decision was rendered, the president said, "What do you mean? What happened?" Encourage your presidents to be involved and understand the process as it goes along and what the impact is.

Finally, this has been a good learning process. We're still in the first few years of learning how financial aid is awarded or should fit into the bylaws. I don't think that it has been a negative process for schools. That's how the committee viewed it. We looked at this from the beginning and said let's learn how to do it and present the issues to schools so that we can make those corrections in the first few years of the process.

I've been impressed with what the committee and staff have done so far. I think the system seems to be working fairly well.

Mr. Banker: As we hear comments from committee members, remember that the floor is open for any questions. This is a unique opportunity. We have several committee members to address one of the biggest programs we have in Division III.

Richard Woodland (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Camden): This is my second year on the committee. The first year was like the first time you take a long trip in the car. It's confusing. You get lost. You can go off on side roads and have to find your way back. The second year was a much crisper review. The numbers show that we were able to move through cases quicker before we got to the final review stage. We have improved the process at the committee level. The staff has provided excellent material for us to work with. We have tried to provide guidance on how to respond to us so that you are not writing 10 blue books about what happened. If you are involved in this process, we do have tools out there. We have staff who will help you resolve issues so we can move on.

Travis Fezell (Macalester College): I was on the committee when we were putting together the statistical model and thinking about the threshold. I came back to the committee this year to do the reviews. The thing that has struck me from one instance to the other is that in some ways it has been very similar. The committee is representative of an institutional perspective, both public and private. It's representative of schools that have large financial aid pools of dollars to give away and those that have very few dollars to give away. It's also representative of an athletics perspective in the way in which athletics recruiting commingles and interacts with the overall institutional financial aid philosophy and the varied perspectives of the members. There are sitting presidents. There are athletics directors. There are financial aid directors. They contributed to a very far-ranging conversation that has not been dismissive of a case. In fact, it has been the opposite. Cases are looked at from varied perspectives to get to issues as deeply as we can. I felt very confident in the nature of the conversations and the ways in which the reviews have materialized.

Kevin McHugh (The College of New Jersey): There's not a lot I can add to what my colleagues have said other than to reiterate that it is an ongoing process. We understand the seriousness of this, and we don't take the responsibility lightly. We have spent a lot of time looking at it from various perspectives and will continue to do

that; however, we're after feedback about the process and incorporate your input into our deliberations.

Tom Weingartner (University of Chicago): What's happened to the 75 institutions involved in the Level II review? Have any of them been sanctioned?

Mr. Banker: That pool of 75 schools includes the schools being forwarded this year. There is a chunk of the 75 schools that need to go through the Level II review process. From last year, we had 25 institutions that were ultimately referred to enforcement. Of those 25, seven were cleared of any financial aid regulation violations. Eighteen schools were sanctioned and had to go through a variety of penalties and educational sessions that the NCAA enforcement services staff issued.

Mr. Weingartner: Can you describe what kinds of penalties were meted out?

Mr. Banker: There was a point of emphasis that in at least the first two to three years of this reporting process that any penalties issued to schools have a significant educational emphasis about the process itself and about the legislation and how it applies to the institution. Those included required attendance at a financial aid conference that either our staff or committee members were conducting, or a visit to the national office, or a teleconference with our staff to walk through the legislation and their particular report to identify the problems that were cited by the Financial Aid Committee. Staff at the institutions that were forwarded to enforcement were also required to take a financial aid legislation exam to re-acclimate themselves to what's expected of Division III institutions.

In future years, the enforcement staff has discussed the nature of more punitive penalties that are issued, but it has been clear that penalties in the first two to three years would involve educational emphasis.

Do any of the committee members want to speak to that?

Ms. Townsley: We agree.

Mr. Weingartner: How do we arrive at the nature of the enforcement penalties?

Mr. Banker: The enforcement of the penalties?

Mr. Weingartner: How do we determine what kinds of penalties will be dished out?

Mr. Banker: The requirements I illustrated were reviewed and approved by the Financial Aid Committee as the appropriate penalties that enforcement would ultimately issue in the first couple of years. Again, they are required attendance at educational sessions. Another significant piece of the puzzle is that any corrective actions that institutions had to take about their financial aid packaging policies had to be corrected and re-submitted to our office so that the Financial Aid Committee could review and confirm that changes to package policies were in fact made.

Mr. Weingartner: So it's the Financial Aid Committee that has input into the nature of the penalties?

Mr. Banker: The enforcement staff handles interactions about the penalty phase with input from the Financial Aid Committee in terms of what should be done in the first couple of years.

Mr. Weingartner: Thank you.

Betsy Stephenson (Emory University): I have two questions. One is related to the presidents' feedback related to how academics have been received as a justification for being over the four-percent variance.

Matt, you mentioned something about reviewing how you carve out leadership in the evaluation of this matter. Once you figure out how to carve out leadership, will that be shared with the membership so that we can plug into that?

Mr. Banker: I can give an emphatic "yes" to that last question. That's obviously going to be critical. We're receiving feedback from institutions and conferences about how we go about doing that. The Financial Aid Committee has not identified any type of legislative proposal to do that yet. They know we need to address the issue because of all the feedback we receive from institutions. We encourage anyone who wants anything reviewed by the Financial Aid Committee when they look at that issue to send it to our national office. The educational component is going to be critical when any type of exception is going to be carved out.

Ms. Townsley: We had schools in the justification that said that their athletes were stronger academically, and that's why they got more money. When we asked for that, schools would show us their awarding policies. Some schools were based on academics. It was stated in their literature that aid was awarded based on academics. They showed us their matrix. Then they did an analysis of their athletes versus the general population and showed us

that their athletes were stronger academically. Schools worked closely with Ann or Eric. They will help you through that process and how to put that forth in the justification.

Mr. Hartung: In that review of policies and procedures, remember that the first thing that the committee looks for is to ensure that athletics is not included as a criterion anywhere across the board. If there is a non-need based scholarship that is purely academically based, we go through the policy to ensure that it is purely academically based by asking them through the submission of information. I would emphasize that.

Ms. Stephenson: I have one more question.

Have there been any inquiries or overtures by any prospective student about whether their participation in intercollegiate athletics based on athletics ability and leadership is discriminatory?

Mr. Banker: Most of the feedback we've had about athletics leadership has come from institutions. I'm not sure if we've received anything specifically from prospective student-athletes. Obviously, it would impact them, but I think the key is that we've identified the issue and the potential inequity that may exist between those participating in athletics and those who do not. That's what we're walking up to at the committee's meeting next month.

Joe Karlgaard (Oberlin College): Has there been or will there be a study that attempts to determine a correlation between competitive success and those in violation of the financial aid policy?

Mr. Hartung: If we had a good measure of success, we may be able to have that study done. We'd need to be able to define exactly what success is. Since I am one of the very few people, even at the national office, who knows the identity of the institutions that moved forward to Level II, I can safely tell you by examining those schools and doing my best to define athletics success among that group, there are schools that are very successful athletically and there are schools there that are highly unsuccessful athletically. As for a study on the correlation between those two, I think that's about as in-depth as we are going to get on that. The NCAA has never tied any of its research to a comprehensive study that tries to draw correlations between athletics success and any other measure.

Mr. Karlgaard: Thank you.

Mr. Hegmann: I have read with interest over the years in The NCAA News about institutions that have been in violation of rules and the sanctions listed. Why have you chosen not to reveal the identity of these institutions and the sanctions applied?

Mr. Banker: The issue of publishing the names of schools that have been forwarded to enforcement is a popular one. You do not see a list of schools that have been forwarded to enforcement because the penalties are being handled as secondary violations. When you look at the enforcement procedures in the Manual, secondary violations are not published and the schools are not identified as such.

A school is identified if it commits a major violation. Referrals from the Financial Aid Committee to enforcement as secondary violations could gravitate to a major violation if enforcement finds additional egregious or intentional violation of the rule or significant competitive or recruiting advantages. When you talk about the institutions that are forwarded to enforcement, please know that they are being handled as secondary violations. The only way in which schools would be identified is if it commits a major violation.

Mr. Weingartner: Could you describe the thinking as to why we added three new triggers for review?

Mr. Hartung: In year two of the reporting process, we included a set of additional triggers. The committee carefully examined the four-percent variance because they are committed to do that throughout the years. The question of whether it is possible to be below the four-percent variance and be in noncompliance with financial aid bylaws came up, so we designed a set of additional triggers to begin the discussion. In most cases, these additional triggers came along with a four-percent variance above that threshold. There were select cases where the other triggers are what sent them to Level I, and they were indeed below four percent. The committee wanted to fine tune their decision-making and fine tune the ability to positively identify cases of noncompliance.

Mr. Weingartner: Could you remind us how we initially got to four percent?

Mr. Hartung: That's a great question. We're statistically testing the amount of institutional aid that an athlete would receive as compared to a nonathlete with similar financial need. We could have anything above zero percent. The committee carefully looked at this and needed to strike a balance between positively identifying cases of potential noncompliance and managing a workload of cases. Four percent is what was decided upon as

a proper balance. This is a number that is going to be reviewed on an annual basis by the committee, and it may possibly change. For now, all of our studies show that this has been a very useful tool in beginning dialogue with institutions, and it has proven to be quite reliable.

Mr. Weingartner: Will you turn to the membership and seek our input if you feel that it's necessary to change that variance?

Mr. Banker: We continually receive feedback about the variance and reporting process. That's obviously illustrated with the new Level I triggers that have been put in place. The committee has received feedback about the athletics leadership issue. We always welcome feedback about the statistical component and the reporting process. Membership input is welcomed and forwarded to the Financial Aid Committee.

Ms. Townsley (Nichols College): When I joined the committee, I wondered about the four-percent threshold as well. It seemed so arbitrary. After being on the committee for a year, it seems like a good threshold to help the committee identify schools we need to look at. Even if you're over four percent and you get a first level justification request, schools sometimes don't go beyond that because they justify it. There were only a few schools that went beyond that, so it seems to be working. But, as Matt said, we're getting feedback. We have been to conferences across the country getting feedback. We're open to ideas. The committee discusses feedback at each meeting.

Mr. Banker: I'm getting the sign to close shop. We have time for a comment from our chair. Dan.

Dan Preston (Linfield College): I'll close with a comment regarding the leadership aspect of financial aid awarding. The challenge for the committee and the challenge for me personally is how can we as a division have a bylaw that states that we won't recognize participation in athletics and yet try to find a way to reward leadership in athletics? That's the challenge. Once you say we're not going to recognize athletics participation but a student achieves something based on that participation, how can you recognize that achievement that's not ability or participation based? If you have great ideas about how we could easily do that, please forward those to Matt Banker, and he'll bring those to the committee. That's a challenge that the committee repeatedly has talked about.

I appreciate the committee's service. There are a couple committee members in the audience. I appreciate their work, the staff's work and the committee members who are sitting before you. I also appreciate the membership for your feedback, ideas and participation in this process. It wouldn't work if we weren't all in this together.

Mr. Nelson: I would like to thank committee members and you. As I've watched the evolution of this process, it has really been a fascinating process. I thank all of you for developing a process and making this as pleasant as it has been so far. As we go forward in trying to define this better, it will be something that we will be exceedingly proud of. I again want to thank the committee, the staff and you. We want to make sure that you provide us with comments as we proceed.

DRUG-EDUCATION AND-TESTING PILOT PROGRAM

Mr. Nelson: Our next session will provide an update on the status of the pilot program on drug education and testing. This is a very important initiative affecting student-athlete welfare and competitive equity. Charlie Wilson, associate dean for academic affairs and faculty athletics rep at Olivet College, will lead the session. He also is a member of the Division III Management Council and the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports.

Charlie Wilson (Olivet College): We went over the time limit, so our presentation will be brief. The discussions about the in-season pilot drug-testing program for Division III began with the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports. As we looked at the data revolving around substance-abuse surveys and looking at comparable usage, especially in performance-enhancing drugs in Division III to Division I and Division II, we asked why aren't we as concerned about the performance-enhancing drug and substance abuse in Division III as we are in Division I and Division II? As you know, in Division I and Division II, we have in-season, year-round drug testing.

As we began our conversations, the committee thought it was a good idea to investigate and get as much information as we could about drug testing and the use of performance-enhancing drugs and other drugs in Division III so we can make more rational decisions about what we should do in Division III.

The other obstacle that we faced was the enormous amount of financing and funding it would take to perform year-round drug testing in Division III because we are the largest of the three NCAA divisions. That was also discussed in our conversations of whether to make a recommendation to the Management Council and institute an in-season drug-testing program.

The Division III Management Council was supportive of the decision to go ahead with the drug-testing pilot program. Today, we intend to give you feedback and an update on where we're at with the methods of the drug-testing program and get perspectives from the Division III SAAC representative on how they feel about in-season drug testing for performance-enhancing and recreational drugs, alcohol, and other substance abuse.

With that in mind, I'll turn it over to Colleen McCullough, who is the Division III SAAC representative.

Colleen McCullough (Chapman University): As reported in 2001 in the NCAA study of substance use habits of college student-athletes, Division III has the highest rates of social drug use of all three divisions. The study was conducted with a sample size of 12 percent of student-athletes of all NCAA championship sports. The data provided show that 50 percent of respondents stated that drug testing should occur.

The national SAAC undertook the charge from both the study and the feedback we received from student-athletes that drug testing and the current situation at the Division III level needed an in-depth look for the safety of student-athletes.

When the drug-testing education pilot program was presented, the national SAAC urged that the educational component be added. We believe that we are charged with protecting the well-being of the student-athletes. Through the drug-education and -testing program, the pulse of the current situation in Division III will more accurately be evaluated. Most importantly, the national SAAC also felt that the educational components are a necessary part of the drug-education and -testing pilot to empower student-athletes by providing them with knowledge and information to make informed choices.

We are aware of the importance of education and how crucial it is at preparing student-athletes for life. We believe the educational component can provide the foundation for success.

Mary Wilfert (NCAA Staff): Thank you, Colleen. We now have a slide show presentation for you.

I think we've missed the first slide, but I'm Mary Wilfert. I am the staff liaison to the competitive safeguards committee. With me are Eric Hartung from our research group and Frank Uryasz from the National Center of Drug-Free Sport. We are going to provide some information to help you understand how the pilot is going to move forward.

The purpose of the pilot is to deter drug use in Division III; to provide Division III information about how drug testing is conducted; and to assess the impact of education and testing.

We do drug testing at Division III championships at comparable levels of the tests we do in Divisions I and II. In fact, we have done some emphasized testing in Division III since we don't test on campus. We don't send a crew from the NCAA to campus to collect samples as we do in Divisions I and II. That's what this pilot will include.

Let me go to the timeline. The two-year pilot will run from August 2007 through May 2009. As a part of the pilot, there will be a pre- and post-survey. There will be education conducted throughout two years, and there will be testing conducted during the academic year at the schools participating in the pilot. We emphasize that because in our year-round testing in Divisions I and II, we test in the summer. In the Division III pilot, that will not occur.

An integral part of the pilot will be an enhanced drug-education model. There was a model that was sent in September to every Division III campus. It took information that we had gathered for minimum guidelines that have been published for about 10 years about what kind of education our institutions should be conducting. We developed a more precise model that provided a timeline and a schedule of when to educate.

Schools participating in the pilot will receive a checklist that identifies times and strategies to conduct education. Toward the end of each year, that checklist will be submitted and a \$1,000 enhancement grant will be awarded to those schools. All schools in the pilot will participate in the educational portion of the model.

Let me refer you now to Frank Uryasz to talk about testing.

Frank Uryasz (National Center for Drug-Free Sport): The National Center for Drug-Free Sport adminis-

ters the NCAA drug-testing programs, and we will be the administrator for the Division III pilot testing program. The schools that will participate in the program will receive more information about the procedures—the if's, where's, all of those kinds of questions—as we move along next semester. Let me explain how the program will work.

The schools that are selected will throughout the year be notified by the Center for Drug-Free Sport of its selection for drug testing. They will be given about 24 to 48 hours notice that the collection crew will be coming on campus to collect samples. At that time, we will ask you for selected squad lists from two to three of your sports. When we receive those squad lists, we'll conduct a random selection of the student-athletes to be tested. Right now, we plan to test anywhere from 16 to 20 student-athletes at each institution. They will be tested for the entire list of NCAA banned substances, including performance-enhancing drugs and street drugs.

Because this is a voluntary program, the schools that participate will not apply any NCAA sanctions for positive test results. In fact, you will not be told the identity of any student-athlete who tests positive. We will provide each semester aggregate reports of the number of tests conducted by sport and the number of positives and what those positives were for. If you're a participating institution, you may receive an aggregate report if you wish. For example, the report would say of the 20 student-athletes tested, 19 were negative and one was positive for an anabolic steroid.

Eric Hartung (NCAA Staff): Approximately 100 institutions will be enrolled in the pilot program. To date, 115 schools have responded and confirmed interest in enrolling in the study. We have ensured that we do have a representative sample based on various institution demographics. This is a representative sample of the wider Division III membership.

When each institution is notified this spring, it will be asked to identify a campus contact, and notification will take place within the next couple of months.

As Mary noted earlier, along with the testing and the education programs, we are going to assess the effectiveness of these programs through a comprehensive program evaluation. We are designing a pre- and post-survey with the first pre-test occurring this coming summer. The survey will be fine-tuned over the next few months. We again would like to emphasize confidentiality is assured at all levels, not just on the testing side but with this evaluation as well. We want to assess the quality of the drug-education program. We also want to assess the collaboration between institutional stakeholders and student-athletes. As administrators, you know that the success of any program is contingent upon the collaboration among these groups.

We also will assess the institution-level drug-test results and the perceptions of the stakeholders and the student-athletes on the education program and on the testing program. Included in this evaluation in this pre- and post-survey design will be questions soliciting responses concerning self-reported substance use.

Ms. Wilfert: We will report to the membership at a number of stops along the way. Drug-Free Sport will report drug-test results to the competitive safeguards committee at its biennial meetings. The committee usually meets in June and then in December or January. Competitive safeguards reports to all three divisions. Its report to Division III will include information about the progress of the pilot. As noted earlier, institutions may request annual reports of the tests conducted on their campus. There will be no identifying information attached to any drug-test result. When the report goes to the individual campus, it will include the number of tests conducted, whether there was a positive and what it was for. It will not be reported by sport or by individual. The aggregate division-wide membership report will include results by sport.

We have received a number of questions as we've proceeded through this process. We wanted to put a few out here and provide the response to those and then entertain any additional questions. One question I received asked about the cost to institutions that participate in the pilot. There is no cost for the testing or education program. In fact, participating institutions will receive \$1,000 to enhance their educational program. Obviously, there are human resource costs. Frank talked about the role of the site coordinator, who will need to provide information and assure that testing is conducted appropriately.

Other common questions include:

- Are there guidelines for education that we are required to do with the student-athletes? Are the guidelines included in the-drug testing booklet or video?

You may already be aware that the NCAA does produce a drug-education and -testing video. We update it about every three years. I got a request yesterday to do it every two years because seniors get bored with it. But this is a good video to show at orientation, before championship events and throughout the year. It does provide student-athletes with the basics of what is banned, what they should be paying attention to as far as supplement use and how testing occurs. For education, we have a step-by-step model that provides information about what you should be doing throughout the year.

- What will it take to develop a written policy?

We will provide sample written policies to assist institutions if they do not have a written policy in place about drug education and testing. It's a very important part of the process, so we will provide some models for that.

- When will the \$1,000 enhancement grant be provided to the schools?

At the completion of the checklist, the school will submit that to the NCAA and that grant then will be disbursed in the spring of year two of the pilot.

Mr. Uryasz: Another question we've received regards the drug-testing consent form. Right now, Division III student-athletes consent to drug testing only at NCAA championships. There will be a different drug-testing consent form required for participation in this program that is separate from any institutional drug-testing consent form that you might have.

We've also been asked about the site coordinator's role. The site coordinator is a member of your staff. Usually it's an individual responsible for compliance or sports medicine or the head or assistant athletic trainer. That person is Drug-Free Sport's contact through the drug-testing process. We'll provide more information to those individuals once they're identified. That person will receive the drug-testing notice. He or she will provide us with the squad lists. That person will notify the student-athletes of their selection for drug testing and then will be available on site to our crew when we arrive to do the actual collection. The site coordinator also would be responsible for obtaining and providing a secure site to do specimen collection.

The site needs to be safe, secure and adequate. Site coordinators will receive additional information defining those terms. The most important thing is security. Our drug testing has to be done at a location that's not used for any other purpose while we're collecting samples. For 16 to 20 student-athletes, the collection process usually takes no longer than two hours, unless some athletes have problems providing samples. Schools will be notified of testing within 24 to 48 hours before our arrival.

Finally, what happens if a student-athlete refuses to take the drug test? This is a voluntary program. Student-athletes may refuse to participate, but we'll track that information and we'll need to statistically count those as positive drug test results—as we would in the year-round and championship program if your student-athlete refuses to be tested.

Ms. Wilfert: Next steps will include notification to those schools that have made a commitment to participate and how they are going to be assigned in the pilot. That will be determined in February. In April, the education and testing groups will be asked to submit a calendar for fall testing dates. This calendar will identify times when students won't be on campus or when it would be very difficult to conduct testing. In August, all schools will be asked to survey a sample of their student-athletes. That plan is still being worked on.

What happens beyond that? For Division III, that question will be re-visited after the pilot is completed. Information from the pilot will be brought back to Division III for further review and discussion. There is no other plan beyond that.

There are two resource sites that are good for folks whether they are in the pilot or not. The Drug-Education and Testing Program information is located on the NCAA health and safety page. You can find information about the surveys that have been referenced and about other education programs. We have not discussed existing education programs, but we have the Apple program, the Choices Alcohol grant and the Health and Safety speaker grants. Other resources are identified there for schools to do alcohol and drug education.

The Division III pilot information specifically is listed on that page under Drug-Testing Program and then Supporting Information. You'll see the communication that went out to Division III schools. The drug-education model is what the checklist is built from, but this is a model that can be used by any school in order to assure

that they are providing education to their student-athletes. We have hard copies of this available at our education services booth, but it also is online. Feel free to stop and pick one of those up.

The National Center for Drug-Free Sport Web site provides more information about testing in general and also provides a link to the Resource Exchange Center, which is a resource for all NCAA schools' athletics administrators and student-athletes to ask questions about supplements, medications and banned drugs. It's very important for them to have that information.

That concludes our update.

Senior Woman Administrator Issues

Mr. Nelson: Our thanks to the panel and special thanks to the schools that have agreed to participate in this educational initiative and pilot program.

Next is a presentation that will focus on the senior woman administrator. This is an important designation mandated by the Association, but there are special issues to be aware of and pitfalls to avoid related to the SWA. Val Cushman, director of athletics at Randolph-Macon Woman's College will lead the discussion. She is also vice chair of the Management Council and a member of the Committee on Women's Athletics.

Valerie Cushman (Randolph-Macon Woman's College): I would like to introduce Karen Morrison, the new director of gender issues and student-athlete welfare in the NCAA office. She has been with us a few months and has already made a large impact on gender issues and student-athlete welfare. Welcome, Karen, from the Division III membership.

I'm going to talk about some of the key aspects related to the legislative and legal issues of the senior woman administrator. I thank Karen, Leah Nilsson and Judy Sweet for helping put this presentation together.

I'll talk about five different areas: misunderstandings, the definition, legal issues, goals and sample responsibilities, and what we will be doing to move forward.

First is misunderstanding. SWA refers to senior woman administrator and implies that it is the senior person involved with the administration of women's programs. In fact, the definition of senior woman administrator refers to the woman who is in the highest leadership role within the athletics organization. The second misunderstanding is that the SWA role can actually be filled by a male. It is in fact the senior woman administrator. There are institutions still listing males in that designation when they forward the names to the NCAA. Finally, there's a misunderstanding that SWA is a job title. I'll talk more about that when we get to the legal issues and implications segment.

According to the NCAA definition, the senior woman administrator is indeed the highest-ranking female involved with the management of a member institution's intercollegiate athletics program. The key word is "management." The designation also means the SWA has some authority and a leadership role within an athletics program. The definition goes on to say that if an institution has a female athletics director, she can designate an additional person to serve in the role as senior woman administrator. That, of course, allows access for more women into the governance structure of the NCAA. That person should be noted as the fifth representative on the form that you send to the national office so the individual can receive information and be able to participate in the governance and committee structure.

The intent of the designation goes back to the days when the NCAA began offering championships for women. The designation was meant to ensure involvement of women in the leadership of the Association and on our campuses. The intent is to have the person serve in a management capacity within the institution.

It's important to note the research of Bonnie Tiell of Tiffin University. Approximately two years ago, she interviewed a large number of athletics directors at the Division III level and a large number of senior woman administrators. In that research, she found two different answers from those two constituencies. Athletics directors were asked if they believed that their senior woman administrator was indeed empowered in her position? Athletics directors gave a resounding answer: "Absolutely yes." Senior woman administrators were asked the same question. They gave the opposite answer of "no." They did not feel empowered in their positions.

As for the legal issues associated with the senior woman administrator position, because of equal employment law, we are not allowed to advertise a position that restricts a given gender applying to that position; therefore, it is not appropriate to include in a position title, "head basketball coach/senior woman administrator" or in a position description the words, "senior woman administrator." In fact, if you send an ad to The NCAA News

with that name in the title or in the position description, it would be sent back to ask you to reconsider how you might submit that ad.

Based on Bonnie's research and the goals, the intent of the senior woman administrator designation is to encourage and promote meaningful involvement of female administrators in the decision-making processes and to enhance the representation of the female experience and perspective at the institutional, conference and national levels, and to support women's interests.

I'll show some sample responsibilities that an SWA may hold. A SWA would not necessarily hold all of these responsibilities. There would not be time in the day to accomplish them all. But one may choose a collection of these to help involve this person in the senior management of the program. They would include budget management, fund raising or marketing, compliance, general administration of the daily operations, monitoring implementation of the gender-equity plan, completing the EADA, advocating for the needs and interests of women's intercollegiate athletics within the department, recruiting, hiring, training and supervising department personnel. Additionally, they can serve as role models and mentors for student-athletes, men and women alike, and participate in educating them on various issues related to their participation.

Finally, their participation in national associations is very helpful to their involvement in the structure of intercollegiate athletics. It's also important that they be involved in the conference structure, either through conferences having an SWA involved in the actual conference administration or through the involvement of institutional SWAs in the conference structure. The opportunity to participate in key decisions on issues for the conference, having a voice in the legislative votes of our conferences, the opportunity to participate in committees and leadership roles, and advocating for the needs at the conference level are very important.

In addition to that quick summary, there are two resources where you can gather more information. The first is the Gender Equity and Issues Forum that is scheduled for April 29 through May 1 in New Orleans. I have attended this conference numerous years, and it is a very helpful and informed conference. Each year takes a different focus. You can find information about this year's agenda on the NCAA Web site. You'll also find more information on the NCAA gender-equity page that is part of the NCAA Web site. Karen is working diligently to bring that Web site up to speed, and there will be more information added to it over time.

The floor is open to ask me or Karen questions.

Donna Ledwin (Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference): When you talk about senior woman administrator responsibilities, there still is a great deal of confusion about who the Title IX coordinator is on your campus. We need to continue to do a lot of education about that. There was a survey sent a couple of weeks ago by a Division III member that asked: "Who is the Title IX coordinator on your campus?" I was flabbergasted when she sent back the results. Many athletics directors or senior woman administrators were designated as the Title IX coordinator.

Val, could you explain the role of the Title IX coordinator? Although it could be, it should not be the responsibility of someone in the athletics department to coordinate Title IX compliance on your campus. That should probably be someone on your human resources staff or your legal counsel office. It should not be the responsibility of someone in the athletics department.

If you said you're the Title IX coordinator, that's probably not correct. You need to find out who is because it's very important for you to educate your staff and your student-athletes if there is an issue with Title IX on your campus. I wanted to bring that to your attention.

Ms. Cushman: It's important to note that Title IX applies to all aspects of your educational institution, not just athletics. I think the SWA may take your point of information back and find an opportunity for education on that topic. Thanks, Donna.

Karen Morrison (NCAA Staff): Last year's sport sponsorship forms that every institution fills out had a new place to indicate who the Title IX coordinator was. We had a pretty low response on that. I'm not sure if that was because it was a new line that people were not familiar with filling out and they just missed it; or, the greater concern would be people in the athletics department who were filling out the form didn't in fact know who their campus Title IX coordinator is.

The Committee on Women's Athletics sent a letter to every president in the NCAA in an attempt to raise

awareness at the president's office and through them the athletics director's office of what the Title IX coordinator's responsibilities are, including making sure that the name and title of the person on your campus, who is often legal counsel or EEOC office personnel, are published so that your athletics department and your entire institution knows the person responsible for grievance policies and procedures for Title IX complaints.

I'm hoping that as the CWA continues to talk about the issue and our campuses respond that there will be more awareness of who is filling that role on your campus. But thank you for your comment.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT PROCESS

Mr. Nelson: Thank you, Val and Karen, for highlighting this important issue.

We earlier mentioned the importance of committee service in our Association and that we'd have an opportunity to review the committee appointment process in more detail. To lead that discussion will be Paul Moyer, director of athletics at Moravian College and chair of the Nominating Committee.

Paul Moyer (Moravian College): On behalf of the Nominating Committee, thank you to everyone involved in our committee structure. We encourage you to submit nominations and apply for committee service.

[Note: Nominating Committee members were introduced and commended for their work.]

I'm going to go through a few slides. This slide represents the Division III structure. It starts with the Presidents and Management Councils. It goes to general committees and then moves to sports committees. These are committees that we review nominations for on an annual basis. Clearly, there's a great deal of service that's required to run this Association because it's membership-driven. We encourage you to be involved at any level.

As for our division's nomination process, 90 percent are self-nominations. We encourage you to submit your own nomination. They're easily submitted online and they stay active for two years. Legislative requirements allow for great opportunities and for diverse representation. That is critical in our discussions as a Nominating Committee.

The Division III committee process is online. Vacancies are published and nominations can easily be submitted online. The forms are easy to complete. It takes 10 to 15 minutes to submit a nomination. We encourage you to look at the NCAA Web site under NCAA.org/membership/governance/committees and then Division III.

The NCAA staff compiles the nominating information and forwards it to the Division III Nominating Committee. I'd like to thank Sharon Tufano and her assistant, Alison Buckley, for their support. They do an outstanding job in compiling that information. Please give them a hand for their efforts. (Applause)

The Nominating Committee then forwards its appointment recommendations to the appropriate body. The Management Council reviews different committee selections for Division III general committees and Association-wide committees. We forward sports and rule committee recommendations. The NCAA Management Council and then the Presidents Council are required to ratify all appointments after the nominations have gone through those respective committees.

We call for nominations for committees other than sport, Association-wide or rules committees in May. The NCAA staff publishes the nominations in The NCAA News and sends e-mails through the conference commissioner and through the National Association of Division III Athletic Administrators. This information is out there. Please avail yourself of it.

The deadlines for submission are in August. The nominations are reviewed by the committee in September. In October, we send them forward for review and ratification by the Management Council and the Presidents Council. In November, notification goes out from the NCAA staff to those selected. Terms begin after the Convention in January.

For Division III sports, Association-wide, general and rules committees, the timeline starts with a call for nominations in October. They're published in The NCAA News. E-mails are sent directly to conference commissioners and the Division III athletics administrators' list server. In December, the deadline for submission of nominations occurs with a February review by the Nominating Committee. In April, the Management Council and Presidents Council review and ratify nominations. Notification is sent in May, and terms begin September 1.

The NCAA Web site has a great deal of information about the committee nomination process. You can find

vacancies, online nomination forms, a tutorial about conference representation, which we take into account to make sure there is diverse conference and independent representation, the appointment process and the timeline.

Here's a sample of the document you would use to complete your nomination. Again, it's very easy. You can cut and paste some of the information off of a Word document into this. You would check the committee you're interested in, whether it's Association-wide, a general committee or a sport committee on that form.

The Nominating Committee has some helpful hints to complete the nomination application:

- Be specific in your interest to serve on a committee;
- Express your understanding of the committee charge and the issues that confront that committee;
- Talk about what you can bring to a committee; and
- List any previous committee service.

The Nominating Committee tries to get new folks, new institutions and all conferences and independent members involved as best we can. It helps us when you tailor your information to a specific committee for which you are applying.

The Nominating Committee considers legislative requirements for each committee in terms of regional representation, gender representation and ethnic diversity. We also look for balance and perspective with conference rotation through those committees. For the championships committees, we look for sport experience. For the Management Council, previous committee experience is something we look for. For sport committees, the preferred qualifications include some regional advisory committee experience, knowledge of the sport as a coach or student-athlete, and sport oversight responsibility. Sport committees not only have coaches on them. We also have administrative service representation, so there are ADs, SWAs and associate ADs on those committees.

When you submit nominations online at the NCAA Web site, you'll find that it is password protected. The Division III access code to share with all your Division III colleagues is committee3, password—2006.

I encourage you to stop by the nominations table. We have a little card that explains what to do and how to go through the nomination process. It's very simple. The password is on the cards in case you didn't write it down.

Three new members will join the committee after this Convention—Rudy Keeling, Emerson College AD; Tim Millerick, AD at Austin College; and Joanne Renn, SWA and Associate AD at Virginia Wesleyan. We welcome them and we would encourage you to talk to any departing or new member of the committee to talk about service. Thanks. (Applause)

Mr. Nelson: Thank you, Paul, for giving us an update on the Nominating Committee. If you have not served on a committee, I urge you to consider serving. I liked it so well I stayed six years.

We will now take a 10-minute break. Please return promptly so that we can begin our legislative agenda.

[Note: The delegates recessed for 10 minutes.]

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Mr. Nelson: Thank you very much for returning on time. It is time to consider our various legislative proposals. The chair of the Division III Management Council, Michael Miranda, will lead us through the proposed legislation.

Mike Miranda (Plattsburgh State University of New York): Thank you President Nelson. Good morning.

We are now ready to consider our proposed legislation. We will consider 14 legislative proposals and related amendments. These are Proposal Nos. 1 through 14 in the Convention Notice and Program. Proposal Nos. 1 through 12 make up the Presidents Council grouping. We will begin with those proposals and conduct roll-call electronic votes for those proposals and any motions related to them. We will vote on the proposals in numerical order in which they were approved this morning. Please remember that there are editorial corrections that appear in the Convention Program. Make note of those. I will draw your attention to them as we go along. Also note that several questions and answers of interest appear in the Q&A document that was attached to the recent Division III newsletter. An updated version of the Q&A has been distributed to the conferences and independent groups and posted on the Web site.

As we did during yesterday's forum, we will call your attention to editorial corrections, the questions and answers, and Council actions and interpretations when we consider each affected proposal.

[Note: Voting procedures were explained to the delegates.]

We are now ready to consider our presidential legislative package.

ETHICAL CONDUCT—SPORTS WAGERING ACTIVITIES

Richard Flynn (Springfield College): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 1 clarifies the scope and meaning of Bylaw 10.3, which pertains to sports wagering. Given the serious consequences of ineligibility or loss of employment for violations of this bylaw, it is imperative that the rule is clearly expressed and easily understood by the membership. President Brand formed a national task force to study the results of the 2003 national study on collegiate sports wagering. The compliance and policy subcommittee of the task force recommended that the language in Bylaw 10.3 be changed in order to make the sports wagering rule easier to read and understand.

The subcommittee also recommended that the president or chancellor, faculty athletics representative, and other athletics department staff members be included so that there is uniformity in the applications of the rule.

Sports wagering is a serious issue. All forms of legal and illegal sports wagering have the potential to undermine the integrity of sports contests, and jeopardize student-athlete welfare and the intercollegiate athletics community. For these reasons, I urge your support of this proposal.

Kevin McHugh (The College of New Jersey): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 1.

This proposal specifically defines the individuals who are covered by the sports wagering bylaw and clearly states the type of activities that are prohibited. The consequences for participating in legal or illegal sports wagering are severe. Accordingly, the recent application of the rule must be easily understood so that no confusion arises. Under the current rule, nonathletics staff members who have responsibilities within or over the athletics department are not included under the gambling activities prohibition.

Proposal No. 1 encompasses those individuals and includes presidents and chancellors and faculty athletics representatives. All will be unequivocally subject to the clearly expressed rule. Current legislation does not prohibit student-athletes from betting on practice sessions. This proposal also establishes that wagering on intercollegiate athletics competition or practice is impermissible. This proposal is clearly worded with the purpose of preserving the integrity of intercollegiate athletics.

Edward Streb (Rowan University): I rise to speak against Proposal No. 1.

It produces no meaningful benefits and it unnecessarily restricts the personal freedom of thousands of people in this Association. This is not an issue of God, motherhood and apple pie as several of you have suggested. It's an issue of unnecessary over-regulation under the guise of uniformity.

I have no interest in participating in any football parlay or NCAA tournament pool. Let me also make it clear that I have been a staunch supporter of the existing regulations concerning sports wagering.

Several years ago as the FAR president, I and the FAR executive committee helped Bill Saum (NCAA staff member) tweak the sports wagering survey that has often been referenced. That survey was sent out to all FARs under my signature. I volunteered but was not chosen for the task force on sports wagering. I take the issue very seriously.

It's clear that sports wagering, especially by athletes, has affected the integrity of several of our institutions and threatened the well-being of our athletes. As a Northwestern alum, I'm fairly sensitive to that. But these concerns have been addressed by the existing regulations. This proposal does not add protection or benefits.

I stopped by the sports wagering booth yesterday and asked them if they could give me an example of a president, a vice president for student affairs or an FAR who has ever fixed or attempted to fix the outcome of an intercollegiate athletics contest. They could not. I asked if they could give me an example of a president, vice president or FAR who had been approached by anyone seeking to fix a contest. Again, they could not.

Let me reiterate that we're principally concerned about two points—the integrity of our contests and the need to distance ourselves from organized crime. The presidents, vice presidents and FARs have never affected the integrity of our Association. Are we hanging out with members of organized crime syndicates? There is no evidence of this.

If this legislation passes, I won't be able to bet a candy bar with my son on the outcome of a basketball game between our respective alma maters; but, as the Philadelphia Enquirer pointed out in its December 31 issue, Dawn Staley, women's basketball coach at Temple University, is now part-owner of one of the newly licensed casinos in Philadelphia. Her casino has no sports book, and she's dedicated some of her profits to charitable causes; however, you have to ask yourself, between coach Staley and me, which of us is more likely to come in contact with people who wager substantial amounts of money on sports contests? Which of us is more likely to be approached for information about a player's health?

What is the sole benefit of this legislation? It's supposed to be uniformity, but then we turn around and make exceptions for those silly so-called traditional wagers. I don't mean to suggest that there's a serious problem with betting 10 pounds of Wisconsin cheese or 10 bushels of Jersey tomatoes, but the bottom line is this—these bets are frequently made public and are picked up in the press. They send an implicit message that sports wagering is okay. Admittedly, the bets seem to be harmless, but they are public bets and are certainly more troublesome than the candy bar bet that I would make with my son in private. Yet, one is permissible and the other is not. This is hardly uniform.

I said earlier that I have no interest in football parlays and basketball pools, but I will admit that I have on occasion participated in a fee-based fantasy baseball league sponsored by CBS. If this legislation passes, I might actually benefit from it. I've never really won much money, and since I started participating, I've been sleeping at night with one eye open, afraid that somebody from CBS might come and attempt to break my legs.

Several years ago, we agreed that we would work to cut back on unnecessary and excessive regulations, yet we find ourselves once again discussing a proposal that can only be described as unnecessary and excessive. It does nothing to protect the integrity of our institutions. It does nothing to help distance affected individuals from organized crime. It purports to provide uniformity, but such uniformity is unnecessary, and it does not provide absolute uniformity. It has led and will continue to lead to a lengthy discussion about what's permissible and what's not. Don't we have better things to do with our time?

My institution is voting against Proposal No. 1. We'll gladly vote for it if anyone can show us any meaningful benefit from its passage. If there are no benefits, I urge you to join us in opposing this proposal. In so doing, you're not taking a stand against God, mom and apple pie. You're taking a stand against unnecessary legislation and unnecessary intrusion in the private lives of our members.

Dennis Leighton (University of New England): I'm the faculty athletics representative at the University of New England and the incoming president of the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association.

The Faculty Athletic Representatives Association strongly supports Bylaw No. 1. If FARs are to be a part of the athletics process, we should be held to the same standards as those more directly involved with the athletics department. I won't give a point-by-point response to the previous speaker; however, let me say this. The faculty reps feel that it is more about the perception than if things are really happening. The faculty reps should not be betting on games that involve intercollegiate athletics. It's as simple as that.

We strongly encourage you to support Proposal No. 1.

Dee Fairchild (Grinnell College): At our conference meetings yesterday, we were told that it had to be a "two-prong" event in order to be a violation. In other words, you had to bet on the front with the possibility of winning on the back. If it is a fantasy football league on the Internet or on ESPN where you don't bet, you just sign in and there is a possibility of winning, that those things are possible.

Jay Jones (NCAA Staff): Yes. That's correct. That is something that's covered in the question-and-answer document and is not different from the current legislation. There is a staff interpretation dealing with pools and fantasy leagues that would not change based on this proposal. That staff interpretation speaks to the fact that to be a wager, something must be put in to the fantasy league or pool and an award must be given at the end of the fantasy league or pool. If one part of that is missing, then it would not constitute wagering under the current legislation or the proposal.

Ms. Fairchild: Would you say that this proposal would be less restrictive than what we have?

Mr. Jones: For fantasy leagues and pools, it would be identical to what is currently out there because that kind of two-pronged answer comes from a staff interpretation that's based on the definition of wagering. It would not change one way or another.

[Proposal No. 1 was adopted, 329-96-4.]

PERSONNEL—CONDUCT OF ATHLETICS PERSONNEL—SPORTS SAFETY TRAINING

John Nazarian (Rhode Island College): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council I, move Proposal No. 2.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 2 provides additional health and safety monitoring for student-athletes by specifying that at least one individual who is certified in first-aid, CPR and automatic external defibrillator (AED) use be present at every required practice, competition and strength and conditioning session. Moreover, the individual must be familiar with emergency plan activation policies.

This proposal is in response to a survey of NCAA death claims showing that 83 percent of all nonvehicle-related deaths occurred during practice and conditioning and that 60 percent of deaths were due to heart-related conditions. An individual certified in first aid, CPR and AED use might make the difference between life and death for the student-athlete.

I have heard some commentary stating that the adoption of Proposal No. 2 would increase our liability related to safety monitoring of our student-athletes. From an institutional liability perspective, by default we are already held to ensuring and monitoring the health and safety of our student-athletes; therefore, this legislation will establish some consistency among our institutions in the monitoring practices for athletics activities.

For these reasons, and for the health and safety of our student-athletes, I urge your support for this proposal.

Charlie Wilson (Olivet College): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 2.

This proposal is vital to the health and well-being of our student-athletes. Making sure that there is a certified individual present at practices, competition and strength and conditioning sessions makes sense. Cost should not be a deterrent to passing this proposal. Multiple agencies offer first aid and CPR training nationwide. Additionally, institutional staff members can become a certified instructor and certify staff at reduced cost. This is not an annual course. First aid certification is good for three years, and CPR certification is valid for one to two years. The automatic external defibrillator may be purchased with Division III grant and initiative funding.

For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal.

Emily Pankow (Luther College): I'm a track and field student-athlete.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support Proposal No. 2. This legislation directly promotes the safety and well-being of student-athletes. The committee strongly believes that individuals certified in AED, CPR and first aid should be present at every required practice, competition and conditioning session.

We also believe it is imperative for each Division III campus to be prepared for emergencies. This legislation requires that institutions have emergency plan activation policies firmly in place to appropriately respond to situations that arise on the field of play. While we recognize that there are costs associated with training and health equipment, we are confident that institutions can comply with this legislation through grants and other initiatives. This proposal makes a commitment to ensuring the safety of all Division III student-athletes.

We urge you to support Proposal No. 2. Thank you. (Applause)

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): For those of us who do not have full-time weight, strength or conditioning coaches and have our head coaches or assistants serve in that capacity; and when our weight room is open to the general public or our student-athletes and we do not have 24-hour supervision, is that a violation?

Matt Banker (NCAA Staff): This proposal requires that an individual certified in these three areas are at activities that would be permissible under Bylaw 17. So any practice, conditioning, weight room or competition activity that occurs during your declared playing season is required to have an individual monitoring it.

For a weight room that's open to any student, including your student-athletes, to come in outside of your season would be addressed by institutional policy.

Mr. Kaiser: I want to make sure I understand. If they're not in the traditional season and they're not in non-traditional season, we don't need to have somebody in the weight room; but, if they're in traditional or nontraditional and even though our coach can attend and the student-athletes are being encouraged to weight-train and become stronger and all that, we do or do not have to have a trained individual present?

Mr. Banker: This proposal addresses any required activity. Bylaw 17 addresses practice, conditioning activities, competition, et cetera. This addresses having someone at those activities that occur during the playing season. The exception you are referring to is to have someone who has department-wide responsibilities to monitor the safety of the weight room. They are allowed to have that; otherwise, coaches would not have any opportunity to interact with student-athletes outside the declared playing season because it wouldn't be permitted.

You are talking about what is going to address activities outside of the playing season that student-athletes or other students not involved in athletics are involved in on your campus. That would be addressed by your institution's policy, not by this proposal.

Mr. Kaiser: When you say playing season, are you including the nontraditional playing season?

Mr. Banker: Yes.

Charles Gordon (Augustana College, Illinois): I have a question regarding off-site practices. A tennis team goes to a tennis center. Two or three of the individuals arrive before the part-time head coach shows up. They begin practice. We're in violation of this proposal.

Golfers go to two or three different courses during the day to participate around their academic schedule. We have a part-time golf coach. There's no one at the course. We're in violation of this proposal.

I certainly support the spirit of what this tries to get at, which is training of staff, which we do, but to try to have someone who is certified at each practice activity is completely impractical in some sports. The person who rolls out the balls for basketball practice, somebody comes in to work five minutes ahead on free-throw shooting and there's no one there, we're going to find ourselves in front of a jury or in a deposition trying to defend why we don't meet this. I completely support the spirit, but the practicality of doing this in some sports means I'll have to vote against this proposal. (Applause)

Mr. Kaiser: I'm not real sharp, so I need to make sure I get this. I need to understand this. What if during the football-playing season our coaches tell student-athletes they need to lift at least twice a week but they're not going to take them out of class time to make it mandatory and that they have to do it on their own? When they go in to do it on their own, are we required to have personnel there?

Mr. Banker: Since it's occurring during the playing season and your coaches are directing them to do it, in essence, it is required even though they may not be the ones monitoring it. Someone who is certified in these three areas has to monitor the activities during the playing season, including weight lifting and conditioning sessions.

Mr. Kaiser: Does the NCAA have enough money to fund these positions that you are now requiring for many of our institutions? Thank you.

Debra Townsley (Nichols College): We had a discussion about NATA (National Athletic Trainers Association) guidelines a couple of years ago. I checked with college legal counsel about the guidelines. He said that you always want to be sure that you keep it in terms of guidelines. We passed that we all have to work toward the guidelines because once you make it a total requirement, according to our legal counsel, you increase your liability. I'm wondering if legal counsel for institutions has been consulted and what the impact of this was. Has legal counsel been consulted on this issue?

Mr. Miranda: I can't respond to whether institutional legal counsels have considered it.

Ms. Townsley: Did the Management Council or the Presidents Council receive any legal advice on this issue?

Mr. Miranda: Not to put words in the mouth of the Presidents Council, but the legal issues related to this were discussed and essentially it seemed to be the consensus that you were going to be held liable regardless.

Ms. Townsley: But was legal counsel consulted? Were there lawyers consulted? We all share in the interest of safety for our student-athletes. That's why we discuss proposals like this; however, I'm concerned about the language in this proposal.

Dan Dutcher (NCAA Staff): I can't comment on the status of the legal review of this particular proposal, but all of our legislation is reviewed by our legal counsel. I can give you an idea of the status of this initiative in each of the three divisions. Division I has not yet adopted this regulation. Division II has actually adopted it but went a step further and required that all coaches actually be certified as the described legislation, which was the original proposal that moved forward from the committee. So, each of the divisions is in a different place. Any time any of these similar initiatives move forward, our legal counsel reviews them.

Marilyn Moore (State University College at Geneseo): I would like to thank the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports for preparing this legislation. It's long overdue.

What was the committee's rationale for adding the additional certification of first aid when the content taught in CPR and AED training courses addresses the necessary first aid to deal with catastrophic injury?

Mr. Banker: The staff liaisons to that committee forwarded the flavor of the conversation when this legislation was recommended. The committee believed that all three of these were necessary for any type of emergency response. In terms of why first aid should or should not be in there, I wouldn't know the committee's exact dialogue when it recommended that all three certifications be part of this proposal.

Ms. Moore: This is over-regulating. I was an athletic trainer for 20 years before becoming an athletics director. CPR and AED are a necessity. I would hate to see that voted down. I would rather see our coaches focusing more on learning that. I would rather that we try to figure out how we're going to afford AED at our practices rather than over-regulating with all of these certifications when AED and CPR are the most important.

Holly Gera (Montclair State University): In light of all of the confusion and perhaps some pretty important legal questions involving this proposal, would it be appropriate to make a motion to refer it back to the committee?

Mr. Miranda: I cannot advise you as to the appropriateness of that; I can advise you that it would be permissible.

Ms. Gera: I move that this proposal be referred back to the committee for further consideration.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Miranda: Would you like to speak to the rationale for referring it back, or would you just simply like to refer to the previous discussion?

Ms. Gera: There seems to be a lot of concerns by most of the membership about the legalities of requiring this, and until some of those things can perhaps be worked out more fully, I think it would be appropriate not to take a vote at this time and send it back to the committee.

Mr. Miranda: We have a motion to refer this back to the committee. Do you mean the Management Council as the appropriate committee or are you referring to competitive safeguards? We need to know specifically which committee you want to refer this to.

Ms. Gera: I move that it should be referred to the competitive safeguards committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Miranda: Thank you. We have a motion before us and a second so we can discuss the wisdom of making that referral.

Richard Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): In our conference meetings yesterday, we discussed this. We support the motion to refer.

The standard of having coaches, athletics administrators and athletic trainers certified is one that we support. In fact, most of our institutions do that already. We think it is appropriate to refer it in the spirit of establishing a standard of having people trained and get away from the more problematic areas in terms of mandating and defining presence and who is there at specific times. Those are the areas that open institutions to increased liability and make it very difficult to comply with, because this does become an enforcement issue. We support the principle of this in terms of training staff, but we'd get away from the attendance requirements.

Doug Tima (Otterbein College): I'm a football student-athlete.

The Division III SAAC does not feel that this should be referred. There's a lot of confusion on the floor. We'd like someone on the dais to help us reiterate the interpretation of this legislation or to explain it.

There are some things that we were told that should be expressed on the floor. We were told that an institu-

tion is not required to have an AED, and it was our understanding that the first aid requirement was covered by the CPR and AED training.

This is a major issue to student-athletes. We want someone there. It does not have to be a coach. It does not have to be an employee of the college. It can be another student-athlete like me. I have this certification. I can go to another sport that I do not play in and am not participating in and serve as the overseer to make sure people are okay. This does not provide a financial burden to the institution. We'd like someone from the dais to help clarify these remarks. Thank you.

Mr. Banker: The delegate is correct in recognizing that this proposal does not require the purchase of an AED. It is just the certification of an AED. An AED and having it available at practice or competition site is listed as a best practice in the NCAA Sports Medicine Handbook.

In terms of the funding issue that was raised earlier by a delegate, there is Division III strategic grant initiative funding that would be available for both an AED purchase to support the best practice and the certification.

It is my understanding that first aid, CPR and AED certification often can be done in one felled swoop. You don't need to take different classes. You can get certified in those areas at one time.

Mr. Miranda: We are discussing the motion to refer, not the merits of the proposal itself.

Marilyn Moore (State University College at Geneseo): I commend my colleagues who are already doing this. However, I would like to see this referred so the regulation could be cleaned up and explicitly state to us which form of first aid you would like us to adopt and which form of CPR training you would like us to adopt. When you look at the different organizations that certify us, there are a lot of different levels. Do we come up with a slate that says we must certify our coaches in a specific area like responding to emergency first-aid? Or is it CPR for the professional rescuer? Which one is it? It's open to a lot of interpretation. In the meantime, it's our student-athletes who are going to suffer while we try to figure out what we need to do.

Tom Weingartner (University of Chicago): We would like to see the definition of being physically present cleaned up. That's problematic for us. I believe that this is well-intentioned legislation, but perhaps it's poorly written. Therefore, we support that it be referred back to committee.

Ms. Townsley: I agree that this is in the best interest of student-athletes; however, I would like to see it referred with a discussion of what the institutional impact is on the wording of this for liability.

John Fry (Franklin & Marshall College): It seems as though there is work to be done on this motion; however, I am against the motion to refer.

I do not want to read any more stories about the untimely and unnecessary deaths of students. We read about them year after year, and there's something we can do to prevent the deaths.

I would much rather defeat the motion to refer, move on and adopt this proposal, which has a very good intent. If we need to issue additional guidance, which we will, let's do that. Let's not do it in the reverse way. There is a sense of urgency here. You see that on the part of our student-athletes. Let's do the principled thing and save the details for later. We'll certainly clean up the details. This is too bureaucratic for my taste in terms of this discussion. (Applause)

Dave Holden (Greenville College): Is a motion to refer debatable or should a vote be taken?

Georgana Taggart (Parliamentarian): A motion to refer is debatable as to the wisdom of referral.

Pam Wojnar (College of Notre Dame, Maryland): I agree with the people who are saying that in principle we need to adopt this proposal. I find it interesting that it's a best practice to have an AED on site but it's a requirement to have somebody certified. You have somebody certified but you don't have an AED to use.

On the motion to refer, I call the question.

Mr. Miranda: We have a motion to end debate on the motion to refer. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Miranda: A motion to end debate requires a two-thirds majority. We will use an electronic roll-call vote to move on the motion to end debate. In front of you is the question to end debate on the motion to refer, not on the underlying motion.

[The motion to end debate on the motion to refer was approved, 420-6-1.]

We can now move to the motion to refer the proposal back to the competitive safeguards committee.

[The motion to refer was adopted, 329-87-3.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—PRESEASON PRACTICE—MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS

We can now move to Proposal No. 3. Please note that the proposal also appears in the Q&A and that there are editorial corrections in the Program.

Richard Wells (University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 3.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is in the best interest of well-being for student-athletes. Before a prospective or current student-athlete can participate in any required conditioning or practice activities, Proposal No. 3 requires a medical examination administered or supervised by a physician. This proposal also requires an updated medical history each year the student-athlete participates in intercollegiate athletics. Current legislation only requires this examination in football. The NCAA Sports Medicine Handbook recommends it for all sports.

Proposal No. 3 establishes a six-month period before athletics participation for the exam to occur. This timetable provides flexibility for the student-athlete, prospect and institution while managing the risk of relying on outdated medical exams. This proposal affords prospective and current student-athletes the benefits of having their health thoroughly reviewed and assessed before engaging in the physical rigors of intercollegiate athletics. The health and well-being of our prospective and current student-athletes are paramount. Proposal No. 3 makes everyone a winner.

For these reasons, I urge your support of this proposal.

Tim Gleason (Ohio Athletic Conference): As a member of the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 3.

This proposal requires prospective and current student-athletes to undergo a physician-administered or assisted medical exam before participation in physical activities. This proposal was put forward by the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, an Association-wide committee. Any physician can conduct the medical exam, including the student-athlete's own physician, as long as the exam is conducted within six months of initial participation in athletically related activities.

An institution may pay for the cost of this examination pursuant to current awards and benefits legislation. A clear benefit to this requirement is that it may result in catching a medical condition that might otherwise have gone undetected until a serious illness or injury occurs. Such a potential delay is unnecessary and unwise.

For these reason, I urge you to vote in favor of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 3 was adopted, 380-39-3.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—NONTRADITIONAL SEGMENT—LIMITATIONS ON ATHLETICALLY RELATED ACTIVITY AND COMPETITION ACTIVITY ON THE ONE DATE OF COMPETITION

Mr. Miranda: We can now move to Proposal No. 4. This also appears in the Q&A. The Management Council has determined that if this proposal is adopted, during its post-Convention meeting it will consider adopting a modification of wording based on the sponsor's intent to clarify that baseball and softball innings must be regulation innings and that volleyball competition may be limited to three regulation matches or 15 regulation games. This was recommended by the Interpretations and Legislation Committee.

Richard Torgerson (Luther College): As a member of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 4.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is a product of recommendations from each sport committee. It has one common goal—to serve student-athlete well-being by specifying a time limit for athletically related activity and competition on the one date of competition in the nontraditional season. Proposal No. 4 specifies an eight-hour time limit that gives sport-specific flexibility. Sports that do not regulate competition by time limit are given an appropriate amount

of competition activity based on sport standards.

Having both a time limit and competition-specific limits gives student-athletes opportunity to compete while safeguarding health and well-being. The Management Council and the Presidents Council believe that a time limit and a competition limit are essential as a package and urge the adoption of Proposal No. 4.

Rosalie Resch (University of Chicago): On behalf of the Division III Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 4.

Proposal No. 4 attempts to alleviate excessive athletics and competition activities occurring on one date of competition in the nontraditional segment. Under this proposal, institutions have the discretion to conduct short-term games in order to maximize the competition opportunity for participants as long as they stay within the eight-hour limit. Moreover, an institution does not need to adhere to official playing rules for competition activities during the one date of competition in the nontraditional segment. For example, a soccer team could participate in six 30-minute scrimmages, thereby increasing the competition opportunities for all participants, so long as the time used for the scrimmages counts toward the competition time limits.

The eight hours of athletically related activities do not need to be consecutive. An institution can split its time into two or more separate sessions as long as the total for all activities does not exceed eight hours. For example, an institution could have two sessions of four hours that together would constitute the eight-hour limit.

Proposal No. 4 would benefit student-athletes by increasing participation opportunities, by protecting their health and well-being, and preventing abuse. There is sufficient flexibility in the proposal to allow it to work for all sports and all institutions.

For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal.

Jill Gremmels (Wartburg College): On behalf of the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association, I speak in support of Proposal No. 4.

Two of FARA's newly adopted guiding principles assert the importance of student-athlete well-being and the appropriate balance between academics and intercollegiate athletics. Both are threatened by the excesses this legislation is designed to correct, and both will be enhanced by the limits it proposes.

I urge you to vote yes.

[Proposal No. 4 was adopted, 365-57-4.]

RECRUITING—TRYOUTS—PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES—TRYOUT CAMPS

Mr. Miranda: We can move to Proposal No. 5. It appears in the Q&A document, and an editorial correction is in the Program.

Marcia Keizs (York College, New York): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 5.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal amends the legislation pertaining to tryout camps in order to make it more inclusive. We are well aware that institutions cannot conduct a tryout camp that is intended to test the agility, flexibility, speed and strength of prospective student-athletes.

This legislation expands the scope of the rule to prohibit institutions from hosting or sponsoring tryout camps. The proposal protects our institutions from negative influences of external event operators.

For these reasons, I urge support of this proposal. Thank you.

Patricia Epps (Franklin & Marshall College): On behalf of the Division III Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 5.

Proposal No. 5 prohibits an institution from hosting or sponsoring at any location a tryout event that is devoted to agility, speed and strength testing in drills like the 40-yard dash, the vertical leap, the shuttle run and the bench press. This proposal helps emphasize that camps and clinics should be focused on instructional activities and educational outreach to prospective student-athletes and not on testing or combined-type activities.

The proposal also addresses what some perceive to be a recruiting advantage when an institution hosts a tryout camp or clinic based on the quality of the institution's facilities. The application of this rule will still allow

institutions to host team camps and similar events, provided these events satisfy the camps and clinics legislation, including the requirements that some instruction or practice programming occurs during the event and that the event is open to all entrants.

Further, this proposal still allows institutions to rent their athletics facilities to any third party at the going rental rate, provided the third party is not running a tryout event devoted to skill- and strength-testing exercises I described earlier.

[Proposal No. 5 was adopted, 317-98-9.]

ELIGIBILITY—GENERAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS—MALE PRACTICE PLAYER ELIGIBILITY—REQUIREMENTS

Mr. Miranda: Our next proposal is No. 6. Please note that the proposal was addressed in the Q&A.

Richard Torgerson (Luther College): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal 6. [The motion was seconded.]

There seems to be two philosophical issues driving this proposal. One is equitable opportunity for women and men. Number two is developing one's athletic ability in preparation for competition to the fullest extent possible.

This proposal regulates the use of males practicing with women's teams. The proposal limits the use of males to one time per week in the traditional season, with the number of males not to exceed one-half of a starting unit.

There are a couple of things to consider. Does the limited use of male practice players mean female student-athletes will be sitting on the sidelines during practice? Secondly, will coaches over-rely on males instead of working to develop female student-athletes?

To respond to the two philosophical issues and protect participation opportunities for female student-athletes, the Presidents Council urges support of Proposal No. 6. Thank you.

Valerie Cushman (Randolph-Macon Woman's College): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak in support of this proposal.

This proposal will regulate the use of male practice players in Division III so that participation opportunities for female student-athletes are protected.

Regardless of the outcome of this vote, it is important to understand existing rules for male practice players. We have a rule on the books requiring these individuals to have their eligibility certified in the same way that any other Division III student-athlete is certified, including the signing of all compliance forms, verification of full-time enrollment and checking for available time under the 10-semester clock.

Let's consider why this proposal is being put forth for our division. We must not forget the importance of preserving meaningful participation opportunities for student-athletes. The use of male practice players is not a requirement. It's a choice. Your coaches could choose other ways to prepare female student-athletes to compete against other female student-athletes.

This proposal retains the opportunity to use male practice players in limited circumstances but establishes that practices will not rely on male practice players. Ultimately, this proposal supports the Division III and Association-wide philosophy of protecting, cultivating and enhanced participation opportunities for women.

For these reasons, I urge your support of this proposal.

Jennifer Warmack-Chipman (Muhlenberg College): As a member of the Committee on Women's Athletics, I share the committee's general position on the use of male practice players.

The CWA believes that the use of male practice players violates the spirit of gender equity in Title IX. The committee believes that any inclusion of male practice players results in diminished participation opportunities for female student-athletes contrary to the Association's principle of gender equity, nondiscrimination, competitive equity and student-athlete well-being.

While it is difficult to actually identify where the custom began, the use of male practice players finds female nonstarters experiencing a lesser development opportunity than female starters and top substitutes. The most common argument in favor of using male practice players is that it improves the skills of female student-athletes

and strengthens the team as a whole. While there is no way to measure the true validity of this argument, if accepted it still leads to the question: What cost in participation opportunities for women is the Association willing to pay for such improvement? The message to female student-athletes seems to be, you are not good enough to make our starters better so we need to use men instead.

This approach implies our cave notion of male pre-eminence that continues to impede progress toward more gender equity and inclusion. Without the use of male practice players, does women's athletics not inherently retain its own unique quality of competition and skill? While progress has been made with female participation opportunities in intercollegiate athletics, women comprise 57 percent of the college student population, yet receive only 43 percent of the athletics participation opportunities.

Any action that threatens the quality of the athletics participation for a large number of females is a step backward. The decision to use non-roster athletes to practice against roster athletes is an issue at all levels and genders of sports. Professional teams do not have the ability to find practice squads better than those on their rosters, and this holds true for most men's college programs, yet somehow this is not viewed as an obstruction to the betterment and growth of the game.

The same can be said at the high school level for both men and women. Reports that female high school teams are now following the male practice player example being set at the collegiate level are disappointing. This could impact participation at that level where the participation gap is 20 percent according to the National Federation of High Schools 2005 survey.

Additionally, reduced squad sizes as a result of injuries have often been cited as validation for this custom. The suggestion that teams need male practice players because team sport size squads become too low for effective practice when injuries and transfers plague a program seems to be the exception trying to argue for the rule, given the average squad size numbers for the last 15 years.

The basic argument of those who support the use of male practice players is that without the use of these male students, the opportunity for growth and betterment of the female student-athletes is limited. The CWA strongly disagrees with this argument. There has been tremendous growth and betterment in women's intercollegiate athletics without the use of male practice players, and the CWA feels that the trend of the use of male practice players does much more harm than good in the long run and discriminates against some of our female athletes. The CWA recommends the elimination of the use of male practice players throughout the NCAA.

Lynda Calkins (Hollins University): I rise to bring two items to the floor regarding this proposal—first, as a former member of the CWA and second, how this particular legislation relates to a very small segment of our diverse membership.

First of all, let's review the history of where we are today. I bring this up because of earlier conversations. Full squads of male practice players have been used and they have been used at the Division III level. There is recruitment of male practice players. They receive full benefits—uniforms, travel, food, lodging—without having to follow the regulations before our passing of the bylaws that we saw in the interpretations earlier today. In watching Final Fours, we've seen full male practice squads exiting the bus right along with our women's team.

Let's move ahead to current legislation and fast forward to what we have today. This is an item of discussion in all three divisions. At the current moment, Division III has taken steps to move these into further legislation, but it also begs the question if this is appropriate legislation for Division III at this time. Have we adequately educated ourselves, our staffs, our colleagues and our conferences about the legislation that already exists?

Each institution must look at this seriously. The CWA has been affected. We're talking. The seeds have been planted. We're discussing this. I don't deny that they have made an impact on how we look at it. Now we're looking at opportunities for all student-athletes. No matter if the legislation is adopted or fails, it is important to note that the CWA has been affected and this discussion needs to continue and be reviewed.

This particular legislation is reasonable and can stand review and scrutiny, but I have questions. Is it appropriate for this division at this time? Is this an example of Division III taking the lead? Are we the tail wagging the dog once again?

There's also additional information—as our previous speaker said—about opportunities and the messages we're sending student-athletes and the trickle-down effect to the high school level. There are other messages that

we're sending. Are we sending messages to our female student-athletes that they are not good enough to play unless there is a man around? Are we saying that the roles of assistant coaches, head coaches, facility managers and team managers can only be filled by males? This begs for further investigation and looking beyond having a male on the court. I ask you to seriously consider that. These messages are part of this as we proceed.

Another part of the discussion needs to consider the diversity of Division III. There are many schools that are single-sex institutions. There are no males on our campus. So there's a 180-degree turn. Have you now put forth discriminatory legislation? I'll be one of the first to file an ARS appeal about this, but who am I looking at? Graduate students and faculty? Do I go six miles down the road to recruit male practice players? We already have excellent legislation on the books. We need to educate. We need to think about referral rather than additional legislation.

Tim Shea (Salem State College): I oppose this legislation for many reasons. The most important to me is the intrusion into the practice arena or the coach's classroom. If we go down this road and pass this legislation, how long will it take before we mandate playing time?

Little or no data exist to show that we have a problem. I agree that more research is needed before we legislate. My little contribution to this future research is that in 26 years of coaching women's basketball and holding 2,000 practices, I've used males eight times. I agree with the previous statement about considering referral for this legislation.

Elizabeth Bass (Women's Basketball Coaches Association): On behalf of the WBCA membership and particularly the WBCA member coaches representing Division III institutions, I urge you to table these proposals. We do not believe that this is an issue that belongs in the legislative process and ask you to consider whether it truly is an issue that should be discussed to identify concerns.

Eight months ago, we met with the chair of the Committee on Women's Athletics. We discussed a need for education and communication. We embrace the opportunity to openly discuss this issue, gather feedback from our constituents and be given an opportunity to evoke change if necessary.

If you believe this is an issue that belongs in the legislative process, we urge you to refer these proposals to the Management Council for study and to continue this dialogue. The WBCA is committed to focusing educational resources on this issue to ensure coaches are conducting their classrooms in a manner that ensures appropriate and ample practice time for all female student-athletes.

Ken Kutler (Ithaca College): After reading the question-and-answer guide, I need clarification about this proposal. If we're talking about a women's tennis program, does this mean that we could have 12 male practice tennis players come in and hit against 12 female tennis players?

Mr. Banker: For sports like tennis and golf, those are considered individual sports, so there is no applicable specific numeric limit.

Angela Baumann (Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference): I move that we refer Proposal No. 6 to the Management Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

As Beth expressed, there is a clear need to gather more data so we can make a better decision regarding this issue.

Mr. Miranda: I am advised that parliamentary procedure dictates that if No. 6 is referred, Proposal No. 6-1, which is an amendment to that amendment, would be referred as well. The whole issue would be referred. Is there any comment on the motion to refer Proposal No. 6 to the Management Council?

Susan Petersen Lubow (U.S. Merchant Marine Academy): For those of us who have very few women on campus, would we be able to ask for a waiver if this should pass due to the fact that when many practices start we don't have enough numbers to start practice? I had three female basketball players on campus October 15 for three weeks. Will we have the ability to request a waiver if this proposal is adopted?

Mr. Banker: Yes. If this proposal were to pass and an institution wanted to use male practice players beyond the regulations specified in Proposal No. 6, your institution could file a waiver with the Administrative Review Subcommittee (ARS), which oversees an institution's request to waive a specified bylaw in the Manual. You would have to come back each academic year to request that waiver, and it would be reviewed on its merits.

[The motion to refer was approved, 359-62-3.]

Mr. Miranda: The motion to refer carries. That means that the amendment-to-the-amendment—Proposal No. 6-1—will not be taken up for discussion.

Our next proposal is No. 7. This proposal also appears in the Q&A.

ELIGIBILITY—SEASONS OF PARTICIPATION—PARTICIPATION AT ANY COLLEGIATE INSTITUTION

James Moseley (Franklin College): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 7.

[The motion was seconded.]

I speak in opposition to Proposal 7, happily demonstrating to skeptics in the room that it is possible for college presidents to change their minds.

A year ago, my Presidents Council colleagues asked me to speak in support of this concept. At the time, we asserted that transfer decisions should be made for reasons other than athletics opportunities. We still believe that, but this proposal ignores the difficulty of holding a student-athlete accountable for the eligibility rules of another division and the decisions made by their coaches. The Council listened to students and now opposes this proposal. While we agree with last year's comments about academically informed transfer decisions, we hope to avoid a situation in which a student-athlete disregards what is in his or her best academic interest to avoid losing a year of eligibility after redshirting in another division.

In light of student-athlete well-being considerations, we urge you to defeat this proposal.

Daniel McKane (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I thank the previous speaker for moving this proposal. The philosophy of redshirting was defeated by four votes in 2006. This motion will strengthen the values of the Division III philosophy during this time of reform.

We have heard from the Management Council and Presidents Council that this is important to protect student-athletes who have had decisions made for them by coaches at the Divisions I and II level. We cannot do that at the expense of student-athletes who initially chose Division III and unlike their Divisions I and II counterparts do not have the opportunity to re-gain a year of eligibility. Division III has made a statement that redshirting is not in the best interest of students. This proposal re-affirms that statement. The foundation of Division III philosophy is student-athlete welfare, and this proposal is in the best interest of student-athletes who have chosen Division III.

I urge you to support Proposal No. 7.

Rudy Keeling (Emerson College): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I speak against Proposal 7.

It does not seem appropriate to hold student-athletes accountable for a pre-Division III redshirt year since it is often the coach and not the student-athlete who decides to redshirt. The eligibility landscape in Division III is very different than at non-Division III institutions where it is common practice in some sports to redshirt all freshmen or any person who is not within easy reach of the starting lineup. While there are a few eligibility rules that transfers become accountable for when they arrive in the new division, the most common circumstance, especially as it relates to seasons of eligibility, is to apply the standard applicable to the division in which the athletics participation occurred. This is the case for medical hardship and the other season-of-participation waivers. Division III has historically used this standard to avoid penalizing a student for decisions made in another division.

I encourage you to support our previous eligibility philosophy and vote against the proposal.

Daniel Fulks (Transylvania University): On behalf of the FAR association, I urge you to oppose this proposal for the reasons so well iterated by the Management Council and the Presidents Council.

We consider it grossly unfair for the student-athlete. The Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference is opposed to this proposal as is my institution. Being from Kentucky, we intend to vote five or six times in opposition to this proposal.

Leon Lunder (Carleton College): I urge the membership to vote in favor of this legislation.

We are talking about decisions that folks make relative to their athletics careers. It is true that student-athletes may not have the option to decide to redshirt; however, they can decide not to accept the redshirt, step out of the sport for that year, transfer to a Division III institution and still retain their four years of eligibility. The fact that they choose to accept the redshirt is a second choice. I want to try Division I is choice number one. The second choice is I want to redshirt a year. The third choice is I want to transfer and I want to get four more years.

The student who transfers to our institution also is subject to coaching choice. The coach decides you're not good enough to play in any games this year but you stay on the squad and practice. You have lost your season of eligibility. You come in with a young man next year who transferred from a Division I or II school. You both are sophomores. He has four years because of his choices. You have three years because of the coach's choice.

Support this legislation in fairness to student-athletes who make a choice to go to Division III institutions.
(Applause)

Steve Wammer (Northland College): I hear a lot about transferring back to Division I and Division II. At our institution, we get what are called "cross-transfers" from junior colleges, NAIA schools and National Christian College schools. We don't keep in mind that a lot of these schools will not track like we track if they practice after the first opportunity to compete. From that standpoint, it's going to be a nightmare trying to find out if they actually crossed that threshold at other institutions.

Tauquir Puthawala (Rhode Island College): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to oppose Proposal No. 7.

Under this proposal, a student-athlete who registered at a Division I or Division II institution and wishes to transfer to a Division III institution would be charged one year of eligibility. The threat of this penalization could force that student-athlete to consider his or her athletics standing rather than his or her academic priorities as a deciding factor in the rationale for transferring. Furthermore, the decision to redshirt at a Division I or Division II institution is rarely within the control of the student-athlete. The committee feels that this proposal penalizes the transferring student-athlete for a decision in which he or she had little input.

We urge you to oppose Proposal No. 7. Thank you.

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): With all due respect to Leon, who is a friend of mine and a colleague, having coached at Division I and Division II for many, many years, oftentimes the decision to redshirt a student-athlete is some times not made until the middle of the season or late in the season when injuries come up. Those student-athletes don't know. I don't know any student-athlete who goes to college and doesn't want to play right away. The decision to redshirt is not made by them and they are held at other divisions on the brink of almost playing. For them to make a decision to transfer or to drop out of the season is really not appropriate.

[Proposal No. 7 was defeated, 82-336-5.]

ELIGIBILITY—CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING SEASON OF PARTICIPATION—MINIMUM AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION—NONTRADITIONAL SEGMENT

Richard Wells (University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh): On behalf of the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletics Conference, I move Proposal No. 8.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the history of this Convention, there are countless examples of proposals with great promise that once adopted have resulted in consequences or inequities that were neither intended nor fully contemplated. The adoption of the seasons of participation legislation as a key component of the president's reform package at the 2004 Convention is one such example. While supported by a clear majority of the membership, including all nine institutions of the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, the subsequent implementation of this legislation has demonstrated that significant inequities exist between fall and spring sports with respect to the amount of practice opportunities allowed before triggering a season of participation.

While the amount of legislation cannot totally eliminate inequities that exist among sports, the current inequity resulting from this legislation can be eliminated by simply removing participation during the nontradi-

tional season as a triggering mechanism for the season of participation. An additional benefit of this proposal is that it would also lessen the confusion and misapplication of the current rule and would reduce the administrative burden and complexities associated with tracking these activities.

It has been suggested that adoption of this modification would dilute the reform package adopted in 2004. The adoption of this proposal would simply signify recognition that this legislation as originally adopted requires some modification to ensure that student-athletes are treated equitably under the application of this rule regardless of whether they are a spring or fall sport participant. It is that recognition that resulted in the Management Council's support and co-sponsorship of this legislation to the NCAA Presidents Council. It is even more significant to note that this proposal is strongly supported by the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

For these reasons, I urge your support of this proposal.

Patricia Epps (Franklin & Marshall College): On behalf of the Division III Management Council, I speak in opposition to this proposal.

It is not uncommon with NCAA rules to find that institutions, coaches and student-athletes view maximum limitations as their baseline behavior. Often they feel they have to use the absolute maximum of what rules permit to become or remain competitive. This proposal provides another example of pushing the limits of Division III rules. It stretches the permissible tryout component of the original redshirting prohibition into a system that allows redshirting to occur during the nontraditional segment. Instead of weakening our maximum boundaries, it is time to protect them.

I urge you to reaffirm the 2004 prohibition on redshirting and defeat this proposal.

David Beckley (Rust College): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I speak in opposition to Proposal No.8. The sponsors indicate that Proposal No. 8 corrects an inequity between fall and spring sports. Before voting, it is important to note that this inequity only exists in a limited set of circumstances, such as comparing fall sport to spring sport teams that do not use the allowable one day of competition. In general, the current rules allow for about 16 practices before a student-athlete is charged with a season of participation.

Also before voting, this delegation needs to know that the Presidents Council remains very committed to sport equity and will pursue alternate ways to correct any inequity that may exist between fall and spring sports. For example, we have asked committees to explore allowing a specific number of practice dates, regardless of the timing of those dates, before a student-athlete is charged with a season of participation. We have concerns that this proposal weakens the Division III prohibition on redshirting.

To remove the season of participation standards from the nontraditional segment is inconsistent with sentiments of this body when it adopted the redshirting prohibition three years ago; namely, that the Division III athletics experience is a four-year endeavor, and student-athletes should not prolong their educational experience for the sake of additional athletics participation. Our student-athletes and coaches should not be consumed with the process of planning a practice schedule that would maximize that participation over a five-year period. Rather, the coach and student-athlete should approach any decision to participate as one of four year-long opportunities.

I urge you to defeat this proposal.

Sameer Khan (Fairleigh Dickinson University, Florham): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support Proposal No.8.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee encourages the opportunity to engage in a limited number of practices without losing a season of eligibility. Under the current legislation, spring student-athletes may obtain a greater number of practice opportunities without using a season of eligibility if the coach chooses not to compete in the nontraditional segment. This proposal affords fall student-athletes an opportunity to participate in additional practices in their nontraditional segment without using a season of participation; therefore helping to resolve the inequity between two sport seasons.

Under current legislation, fall student-athletes are not given the choice to participate in the nontraditional segment in the same manner that spring sport student-athletes can.

The purpose of a nontraditional season is for instruction, team building and assimilation into the collegiate experience. This proposal values that purpose.

We strongly encourage you to support Proposal No.8.

Dennis Leighton (University of New England): I am the incoming president of the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association.

The Faculty Athletics Representatives Association supports Proposal No.8. Our association feels this proposal corrects an inequity between student-athletes participating in fall or spring sports. The application of a bylaw should apply equally to all student-athletes and should not be dependent on the season of the student-athlete's sport. This proposal will allow practice in the nontraditional segment without using a season of eligibility as long as the student-athlete does not compete. This proposal is a fairness issue and is best for student-athlete well-being.

Greg Fredricks (Lewis & Clark College): This proposal is not about redshirting. It's about equalizing practice opportunities in the nontraditional segment.

The current inequity is a consequence of the timing of our academic year. Using a calendar year instead would reverse this inequality. The Presidents Council has acknowledged the problem; however, they oppose this proposal because they want to—and I quote from the NCAA News—"better define any inequities and propose alternative solutions."

We have a solution before us now. If a better solution arises later, I will happily vote for it at a future Convention. A vote against this proposal is a vote to continue this acknowledged inequity for at least another year. I urge you to support this principle of equal practice opportunities now.

[Proposal No. 8 was adopted, 319-100-5.]

DIVISION MEMBERSHIP—PROVISIONAL AND RECLASSIFYING MEMBERSHIP— APPLICATION STANDARDS AND COMPLIANCE WITH DIVISION REGULATIONS

Mr. Miranda: We can now move to Proposal No. 9. There is information in the Q&A document and an editorial correction appears in the Program.

Jack Ohle (Wartburg College): As a member of the Division III Management Council and on behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 9.

[The motion was seconded].

This is the first of two proposals that address governance structure growth management strategies in the short-term. While the Executive Committee is looking at the broader membership issue of the NCAA, this division should verify that institutions joining Division III align strongly with the values and philosophy of the division and that growth of the division occurs at a manageable pace.

This proposal limits maximum incoming provisional and reclassifying class size to four and provides a mechanism to ensure that institutions in that class embrace the values and philosophy of the division from a theoretical and a practical standpoint. It raises the bar in sport sponsorship and rules compliance expectations. It requires provisional and reclassifying institutions to meet sport sponsorship and all other Division III requirements at the time of application.

It requires provisional and reclassifying schools to make a greater financial commitment to sign on to our division, increasing the membership fee from \$12,000 to \$20,000 to offset the additional cost of administering a more in-depth membership program.

This proposal gives the Membership Committee the authority and the responsibility to place institutions in a membership class based on established criteria, replacing the former lottery system, and rewards prepared institutions with a shorter wait to join the division.

This new provisional and reclassifying program represents an important piece of the division's growth-management strategy. It should not be reviewed as the final answer to the division's structural challenges, but it should be adopted as the first piece of a broader plan to address our growth.

I urge you to adopt this proposal.

Kristen Hall (Bard College): As a member of the Division III Management Council and Membership Committee, I would like to explain the details of this proposal and comment on the nature of recent committee experience with applicants.

As President Ohle stated, the proposal requires that provisional and reclassifying institutions meet sport-sponsorship requirements at the time of application; specifically, institutions must have met their Division III sport-sponsorship requirements during the year immediately preceding the application, including the minimum number of sports, contests and participant requirements. This is a very significant change.

In recent years, there have been very few applicant institutions in full compliance with Division III sport-sponsorship requirements. The committee regularly sees institutions struggle to meet those requirements, especially participant minimums.

Another significant change relates to the maximum allowable class size. The current program allows as many as six provisional institutions and an unlimited number of reclassifying institutions to begin the program each year. This proposal establishes a maximum incoming class size to four with a waiver to address any extraordinary circumstances that may come before the committee and Councils. In an effort to establish a strong support network for new Division III members, this proposal requires provisional and reclassifying applicants to be sponsored by an active Division III member. Applicants will be required to submit a letter of recommendation signed by the sponsoring institution's president or chancellor, athletics director, senior woman administrator, and faculty athletics representative. The proposal's requirements mean the school will join the division with a valuable practical resource and sounding board.

In an effort to improve the overall quality of programs entering Division III, provisional and reclassifying applicants will be required to demonstrate a functioning compliance system. While this system need not be perfect, new Division III members should exhibit efforts to monitor specified activities of student-athletes and staff.

This proposal is offered by the Membership Committee and the Management and Presidents Councils to safeguard the quality of programs entering the division. While it does reflect one-half of the governance structure package, these program enhancements are good for the division regardless of how you vote on other membership proposals today.

I urge your support of Proposal No. 9.

James Nelson (Suffolk University): "To dream the impossible dream, to fight the unbeatable foe, to bear with unbearable sorrow, to run where the brave dare not go, this is my quest, to follow that star, no matter how hopeless, no matter how far."

I'll leave the rest for later.

Mr. Miranda: Although I'm from Boston, I'm darn close to ruling that out of order.

Mr. Nelson: The recorder who is taking down our words is probably wondering how to put that. What I would say to you would be off-key at this point. I did have the opportunity to see "Man of La Mancha" before I came here, and it normally does inspire me. For those of you who have supported or encouraged my efforts in the past, I'm certainly thankful of that; but more than encouragement, I would like to have your vote.

I may be the only individual who has never had the opportunity to bring forward reconsideration because I have never been on the prevailing side of an issue. That may be the case on this.

I base my objection to this proposal on a historical note. The adoption of automatic qualification for our championship teams, along with categories B and C, have provided wonderful opportunities for so many of our student-athletes. However, there is still an inequity for some of our teams. The example I use is men's and women's basketball because we're still giving byes in those championship tournaments. Giving a bye leads to an inequity to all of those other teams who are selected for a tournament.

As a consequence of this proposal, we still have a moratorium that is ongoing. Only four institutions would be allowed to come in at any one time. This would continue to push the clock back before we would come to what would be the appropriate number, in this instance 64. We're close for one gender, but we need to be equitable for all student-athletes.

There's a lot of good in Proposal 9. But I will stick to my historical perspective until we have equity down the line for all of our teams in the 64-team tournaments.

I oppose this proposal.

[Proposal No. 9 was adopted, 367-51-4.]

DIVISION MEMBERSHIP—CONDITIONS AND OBLIGATIONS OF MEMBERSHIP—EDUCATIONAL INITIATIVES

Mr. Miranda: We can now move to consider Proposal No. 10. This proposal was also discussed in the Q&A.

John Fry (Franklin & Marshall College): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 10.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 10 represents the second half of the Presidents Council's membership package. It establishes basic expectations and accountability for active Division III members.

The Membership Committee reviewed recent attendance at key NCAA events by Division III members and found a great disparity in behavior. While most institutions participate in the annual Convention, there is a group of institutions that rarely or never attend. There is a great number of Division III schools that never take advantage of the educational and professional development opportunities offered by this division despite the availability of generous funding.

In light of the growth challenges facing the division, we cannot afford to retain institutions that do not take membership in this Association seriously or embrace the necessary commitment to Division III that benefits all of us. This proposal moves us forward as a division in terms of building a membership base that is more educated about Division III regulations and attentive to best practices and is accountable to our philosophy statement. It also positions this division to examine the best overall future membership structure.

I urge you to adopt Proposal No. 10.

Richard Strockbine (University of Dallas): On behalf of the Division III Management Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 10.

This division gives a lot to its members. Its members should be accountable to a few basic expectations beyond sport-sponsorship requirements. At a minimum, our members should be attentive to the workings of the division, attend the annual business session and understand its basic legislative requirements.

We could all benefit from the major educational initiatives put forward by our Membership Committee, including the rules test and regional rules seminars. I understand that some institutions may be concerned about the cost of sending a representative to the regional rules seminar, so I remind all delegates that Tier 1 of the new strategic initiatives grant program contains dollars specifically targeted for these seminars. Additional money is available in Tier 3. A once-in-three-year commitment is a modest expectation that will reap many benefits for your institution and the division.

Finally, the Membership Committee will begin to audit institutional compliance with sport-sponsorship requirements. Because of the importance of the broad-based program expectations for the division, the committee will begin to verify that the information submitted by institutions on their sport-sponsorship forms is valid and that they meet all Division III membership requirements. It is time for all active Division III members to be more accountable and effective members. This proposal puts many tools in place to help this happen. Please vote in support of Proposal No. 10.

[Proposal No. 10 was adopted, 328-88-6.]

DIVISION MEMBERSHIP—MAXIMUM CAPACITY

Mr. Miranda: We can now move to Proposal No. 11. Please note that the proposal is included in the Q&A.

Douglas Bennett (Earlham College): We would like to withdraw Proposal 11. I would like to say a few words about why it's being withdrawn.

I want to speak on behalf of the fundamental restructuring of Division III—a restructuring that we need to recognize may affect more than our division. Together, we create conferences. Together, we created the NCAA.

We did that to structure competition in intercollegiate athletics in a fair and equitable manner. From time to time, we need to recognize that we need to change those organizational arrangements. We've arrived at one of those moments.

The current symptom we need to recognize is that Division III has simply become too large. It's too unwieldy to be effective. It's too large to be fair for all the purposes we want it to achieve. For some, the problem from that size is access to postseason play. For others, the problem is persistent, and there are irresolvable disagreements among us about philosophy and rules.

Disagreements spill over year after year into this Convention, where we notice that we are deeply divided on some philosophy issues. We're simply trying to include too many different kinds of institutions under one umbrella.

We have arrived at a moment for restructuring, but we arrived at that moment a number of years ago. The problem of Division III being too large will only become worse if we continue not to attend to it—particularly with the prospect of NAIA members coming our way in larger numbers. We need to restructure, and we need to do it soon. We proposed a membership cap from the NCAC (North Coast Athletic Conference) as a first step. We don't see that as a comprehensive solution in and of itself, but it's something to move along the restructuring process. We first proposed it last year because we did not feel a shared sense of urgency to restructure. We simply didn't see a commitment to face this problem quickly and squarely.

When we proposed the cap last year, the Division III Presidents Council proposed the first beginnings of a process to address restructuring. The NCAC accepted a referral on this issue to a special committee. During the past year, there have been some positive things that have happened. The Presidents Council has brought forward Proposals 9 and 10, which we've just approved, and it's largely because of that approval that we now want to withdraw the cap proposal. We have a continuing moratorium on new members. It gives us time to work through restructuring. The NCAA has committed itself to reviewing divisional structuring. We very much appreciated incoming chair John Fry's presentation yesterday at the Division III Issues Forum. We're seeing a stronger sense of urgency and a stronger commitment from the Presidents Council to address restructuring.

We're still concerned. The process is moving too slowly in our view. We had hoped that at this Convention we'd see some models for restructuring. Now we're promised those models next year—but at least we've been promised that we'll see those.

We want to withdraw our cap proposal, but we want to add our renewed urgency that we work together to bring about restructuring. We need to do this as quickly as we can. We know this is an issue that affects Division III and the NCAA. There are implications for Division II and Division I. But if that means we need to think comprehensively, it doesn't mean that we can take that to be a reason for delay. We need to challenge those other divisions to work with us to find a solution that creates fair and effective organization of competition in intercollegiate athletics. The NCAC would like to thank those who have supported this proposal in the past.

We withdraw our proposal and ask all of us to work together toward fundamental restructuring of NCAA divisions. (Applause)

LEGISLATIVE PROCESS—AMENDMENT PROCESS—SPONSORSHIP REQUIREMENTS

Mr. Miranda: With the withdrawal of the proposal, we can move to Proposal No. 12.

Miriam Pride (Blackburn College): As a member of the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 12.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal increases the sponsorship requirements for membership-sponsored proposals and resolutions. Division III is the largest membership division, yet it currently has the lowest sponsorship threshold in the NCAA.

Our sponsorship minimum threshold is eight active member institutions or one voting conference. Increasing the requirement from eight institutions to 20 and from one voting conference to two represents a corresponding change in representation from two percent to almost five percent of the Division III membership.

A greater threshold protects the membership from special-interest legislation and ensures that all members are better represented in the legislative process. This proposal will improve the overall quality of legislative concepts submitted for a vote since additional consultation and consensus building will be required. As a result, Division III will benefit.

For these reasons, I urge your support of this proposal.

Sandra Slabik (Neumann College): As a member of the Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee and Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 12.

Proposal No. 12 seeks to increase the membership representation associated with membership-sponsored proposals and resolutions. By increasing the sponsorship threshold for proposals and resolutions, there will be an increased dialogue and debate before the Convention. This will lead to more thorough and thoughtful legislation. This proposal is consistent with recent objectives to increase accountability of Division III conferences in the legislative process. The conference self-study guide asks conferences to review the input and authority for legislative proposals. Likewise, member institutions will benefit from closer review and consideration of legislative concepts and greater representation afforded under this proposal.

Special-interest legislation has no place in Division III. Membership-sponsored proposals should be just that—for the membership's benefit. Proposal No. 12 seeks to accomplish this purpose.

For these reasons, I urge you to vote in favor of this proposal.

Michael Pernal (Eastern Connecticut State University): On behalf of the presidents and athletics directors of the Little East Conference, I speak in opposition to this proposal.

The proposal's rationale indicates that its passage would promote increased, meaningful dialogue, refine legislation before it reaches the Convention floor and protect against special interests.

Addressing the special-interest issue, people have to understand that for legislation to get to this level, it must pass by presidents who are committed to their academic mission. Student, faculty and athletics directors' interests must be weighed. That's a pretty consequential screening process before a proposal gets to the level of debate.

Conferences consist of institutions that compete against each other. It is no simple feat to get your own conference to support a proposal. We contend that this proposal will in no way increase the dialogue or refine proposals more than what goes on now.

For proposals to get to this level, there is substantial dialogue as institutions seek to have their measures supported. In short, it is the Little East's contention that this proposal is too much of a good thing. We believe that there ought to be a threshold and believe that the current one is adequate.

We urge you to vote against this proposal.

Richard Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): On behalf of University Athletic Association members, I also urge opposition to this proposal.

The suggestion that the current threshold promotes special-interest legislation is not borne out by our legislative history. Our legislative agenda has been overwhelmingly driven by the governance structure. The proposals that have come forth from the membership have been appropriately well-considered and create the kind of dialogue that's necessary.

When we sponsor legislation, many of us seek co-sponsorship from other conferences. The legislative process is not just confined to proposing the amendments-to-amendments at the start of proposing a change. We also are involved in responding to other members' proposals and responding to proposals that come out of the governance structure. Proposals from the governance structure come out much later than the membership proposals.

When you're trying from a practical standpoint to respond to those proposals with an amendment-to-an-amendment or a resolution, those things come up much later and the deadline is much tighter. Working it through a conference process to respond is very difficult. If we have to take the additional step of working through another conference and coordinating conference meetings and so on, it can have the effect of diluting the membership's voice rather than promoting dialogue as is suggested.

Richard Kaiser (Defiance College): It has been the emphasis of this governing body to replace the emphasis upon conferences and conference championships, thus the AQ (automatic qualification). All of a sudden, now we're saying we need to have two AQs before we can put legislation on the board.

The body of this institution has always been one vote/one institution. We join conferences because we have like interests. That's why we come together. I would like to think that as a conference we could continue to bring

information and agenda items to this body and talk about it. By the time we're done here, we will have spent a grand total of two hours on 14 proposals. I don't think it's cumbersome.

Chris Martin (College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin): As a member and the incoming chair of the Division III Membership Committee, I urge you to defeat this proposal.

For the past two years, your Division III Membership Committee has considered the impact of a membership cap on the division. For the 2006 Convention, the committee did not take an official position on the cap proposal. At that time, the committee agreed the matter was best left for a full ...

Mr. Miranda: I'm sorry, Chris. I've got to rule that out of order because we're not considering that particular proposal.

Mr. Martin: Okay.

Mr. Miranda: We're on No. 12 right now. Are there any other comments on this particular proposal?

[Proposal No. 12 was adopted, 240-177-5.]

That concludes this morning's Presidents Council grouping. Thank you very much for your attention and cooperation. After lunch, we will open the window of reconsideration for proposals voted on this morning. The results of this morning's roll-call votes will be posted on the bulletin boards outside of this room. With that, I will turn the lectern back to Ivory.

Mr. Nelson: In order to conclude our business, we would like to open our window of reconsideration at 12:45. Thank you, very much.

[The delegates recessed for lunch from 12:15 to 12:50 p.m.]

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Nelson: Our first order of business will be to elect our new Management Council members. After that, we will open the window for any motions to reconsider this morning's roll-call votes. A motion to reconsider can only be made by someone who voted on the prevailing side. Any voting delegate can second that motion. Reconsideration then occurs by a majority vote. If the motion to reconsider is adopted, the morning vote no longer applies and the proposal then is back before us for further discussion and another vote.

Please remember that to vote on a motion to reconsider and any subsequent vote will require a roll-call vote since Proposals 1 through 12 and the related amendments also were roll-call votes. After reconsideration, we will vote on Proposal Nos. 13 and 14. Our final scheduled item of business will be to open the window of reconsideration for those two proposals. Our goal is to adjourn by 1:45 p.m. (Applause) I encourage you to work assiduously.

ELECTION OF MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEMBERS

It is now time to elect our new Management Council members. Under our governance structure, the Nominating Committee initially solicits and selects Management Council nominations. The Management Council and the Presidents Council then review the nominations, but the positions ultimately are filled by a vote of our membership during our annual business session. We have four new appointments. You should have received the slate of nominees with your registration materials.

The official slate of nominees will be presented by the Nominating Committee chair, Paul Moyer, director of athletics at Moravian College.

Paul Moyer (Moravian College): The Nominating Committee wishes to thank the Division III membership for its interest in serving in the NCAA governance structure. One Management Council vacancy was filled in October 2006 by Garnett Purnell, director of athletics at Wittenburg University. The committee also notes that Kayla Hinkley, University of New England; and Steven Suggs, Stevens Institute of Technology student-athletes, have been selected as Student-Athlete Advisory Committee representatives to the Management Council.

On behalf of the Nominating Committee, I move the following slate of nominees for service on the Division III Management Council: Susan Chapman, director of athletics, Worcester State College; Daniel Fulks, faculty

athletics representative, Transylvania University; Stuart Gulley, president, La Grange University; and Lynn Oberbillig, director of athletics, Smith College.

Mr. Nelson: Thank you, Paul. The committee nominees have been moved. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

We can use our paddles for this vote. All of those in favor of the slate presented by the Nominating Committee, please raise your paddles. All opposed? Abstentions?

Congratulations to our new Management Council members. Please stand so you can be recognized. (Applause)

We have two new members of the Management Council who will be representing the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. They are Kayla Hinkley, University of New England; and Steven Suggs, Stevens Institute of Technology. Would you please stand? (Applause)

I also want to remind the delegates of our recent appointments to the Presidents Council. Council members are appointed by a vote of Division III presidents and chancellors. Our new members are: James Harris, Widener University; Morton Schapiro, Williams College; and Kathleen Owens, Gwynedd-Mercy College. Would you please stand? (Applause)

It is now time to resume our legislative agenda. Leading us through this process will be Mike Miranda.

WINDOW OF RECONSIDERATION

Mike Miranda (Plattsburgh State University of New York): We have two legislative tasks this afternoon. The first is the window of reconsideration related to our roll-call votes; the second is to deal with our remaining legislation—Proposal Nos. 13 and 14.

The window of reconsideration is open for Proposals 1 through 12 and related amendments. A motion to reconsider can only be made by someone who voted on the prevailing side during the last vote. Any voting delegate can then second that motion. Reconsideration then occurs by majority vote. If the motion to reconsider is adopted, the morning vote no longer applies and the proposal is then back before us for further discussion and another vote. Finally, please remember that the vote on a motion to reconsider any of these proposals and any subsequent votes on them will require a roll-call vote since Proposal Nos. 1 through 12 and the related amendments also were roll-call votes.

Is there a motion to reconsider Proposal Nos. 1 through 12 and their related amendments from someone who voted on the prevailing side?

Richard Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): I would like to speak to Proposal No. 12. I can't move for reconsideration since I did not vote on the prevailing side, and I don't believe that reconsideration would be the best way to address the situation.

For the record, I request that the Management Council and the Presidents Council consider looking at this proposal. The timeline that currently exists for the notification of the membership is a September 23 deadline for notification with regard to governance proposals, with a November 1 requirement for submitting amendments-to-amendments and resolutions. That provides less than five weeks for the membership to respond and gather eight presidents from one conference to come to a decision. It then requires eight presidents from another conference. I suggest either removing the requirement for two conferences and the larger number of institutions from the amendment-to-the-amendment and resolution process or perhaps changing the timeline to September 1 so that we can facilitate the kind of dialogue that was intended by the legislation. I respectfully request that.

Mr. Miranda: We will take that suggestion back to the Management Council and Presidents Council. That's easy for me to say since I'm not going to be on it, but we do appreciate that.

Are there any items to be moved for reconsideration?

[No motions for reconsideration were made.]

The window for reconsideration is closed.

We can now consider Proposal Nos. 13 and 14. We'll vote on these proposals using the voting units; however, we will not produce a roll-call vote.

ETHICAL CONDUCT—GAMBLING ACTIVITIES—SANCTIONS —TIMING OF REINSTATEMENT REQUEST

Kay Whitley (Sul Ross State University): As a member of the Division III Management Council and on behalf of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 13.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal does not affect the minimum one-year eligibility penalty for a student-athlete who solicits or accepts a bet or who participates in gambling; rather, Proposal 13 addresses the timing for processing a reinstatement request for that ineligible student-athlete.

Currently, a request for reinstatement can be submitted only after the student-athlete has fulfilled the one-year period of ineligibility. Proposal No. 13 allows an institution to file a student-athlete reinstatement request once it realizes the student-athlete is ineligible. This change streamlines the student-athlete reinstatement process by allowing the reinstatement staff to process the request before the completion of the penalty. The staff has the opportunity for a thorough and complete review without the pressure of pending competition, and the institution has an earlier opportunity to assess the situation and file an appeal. Thus, the proposal is in everyone's best interest.

For these reasons, I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 13 was adopted.]

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS—BASKETBALL—ANNUAL EXEMPTIONS —EXHIBITION CONTEST AND PRACTICE SCIRMMAGES

Tim Gleason (Ohio Athletic Conference): I move Proposal No. 14.

[The motion was seconded.]

A few years ago, our friends in Division I decided to only allow exhibitions in basketball against four-year colleges. This creates opportunities for us without negative impact on student-athletes or budgets. This is optional legislation with equal opportunities for all of us. We ask for your support.

Jone Dowd (Catholic University): On behalf of the Division III Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal 14. This proposal permits one exhibition basketball contest to replace one of the two permissible practice scrimmages. The exhibition contest must be against Division I or II institution. This proposal also provides institutions with flexibility to schedule exhibition contests against Division I or II opponents without extending the playing season or overall number of competition opportunities in basketball.

In addition, the student-athlete experience could be positively impacted from the unique opportunity to compete against Divisions I and II institutions.

For these reasons, I urge you to vote in favor of Proposal 14.

[Proposal No. 14 was adopted.]

WINDOW OF RECONSIDERATION

Mr. Miranda: We will now open the window of reconsideration for Proposal Nos. 13 and 14. Is there a motion to reconsider any of our previous votes on Proposal Nos. 13 or 14 from someone who voted on the prevailing side?

Seeing no one moving to a microphone, I can officially declare the window of reconsideration now closed.

CLOSING REMARKS

That concludes the afternoon's formal legislative agenda. I will now turn the gavel back to President Nelson. Thank you for your attention. (Applause)

Mr. Nelson: Thank you, Mike, for leading us through the legislative agenda.

Are there other topics of interest that the delegates would like to discuss?

Valerie Cushman (Randolph-Macon Woman's College): I would like to thank Michael Miranda for his service as chair and member of the Division III Management Council. He has served two years in this capacity. He's selected by his peers to serve in this capacity for many reasons that I would like to describe.

First, is the wisdom that he brings to our discussions. Secondly, is his sense of fairness. Thirdly, is his commitment to achieving the will of the membership. Fourth is his commitment to our fundamental goal to provide balance, yet unparalleled opportunities for our student-athletes. Finally, and probably most importantly, is his sense of humor. Mike, we thank you for your four years of service. You have brought us a long way in your four years. We can't thank you enough for your time and commitment.

[Note: The delegates extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

John Fry (Franklin & Marshall College): I would like to pay tribute to Ivory Nelson, who is stepping down after six years of incredibly distinguished service to Division III, most recently the Presidents Council chair. Ivory, you have presided and been a member of the Presidents Council during what has arguably been one of the most important and tumultuous times in Division III history. You have done so with grace, great commitment and a great sense of humor. We are deeply appreciative to you.

As I think back on your tenure as a member and chair of the Presidents Council, three enormous things have happened—all of which you have been intimately involved in.

The first is the reform movement. You were a major participant in crafting the legislation in 2004 and also upholding and advancing the various positions in 2005 and 2006, so you are a true reformer. The second thing you are is an innovator. During that period of time, particularly in the last two years, you have taken on the leadership of the President's Council. We have seen innovations such as the block grant budget process to support conferences from a financial standpoint; we have seen the drug-testing pilot go into effect; and we have seen the financial aid pilot go into effect. You have been a marvelous innovator during this period of time. Lastly, and in many respects most importantly, you've been a great leader. Great leaders leave organizations better off than when they found them. I think you've positioned us over the next several years to have a reasonable and rational and spirited debate on the future membership structure of Division III. There was a lot of work leading up to the point we got to yesterday, and you're responsible for leading most of it. We're deeply grateful for what you've done.

On behalf of everyone in the Division III family, thank you profoundly for your wonderful service. You have given us a tremendous legacy to work from, and I am deeply honored to follow in your footsteps.

Mr. Nelson: Thank you.

[Note: The delegates extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

Thank you. It has been a great ride, and it has been fun. I've met some great folks and had a wonderful time. Although it is work, it's something that I dearly love. It has really been a rewarding experience, not so much for athletics, but because it's something that is so important in our educational institutions. Too often, those of us who are at the top do not involve ourselves enough in what happens in the structure of how athletics operates. I feel that it's so important. Thank you for the opportunity to serve.

Our meeting is adjourned.

[The Division III business session was adjourned at 1:14 p.m.]

OVERRIDE VOTE

Pursuant to NCAA Constitution 5.3.2.3.1, upon receipt of 30 (15 for a football championship subdivision-only issue) requests for an override vote, the adoption of a legislative change or the failure of a legislative change shall be subject to a vote taken by the membership.

The proposals in this section received a sufficient number of override requests and are subject to the membership vote.

The resulting override votes will occur during the Division I business session, which will be conducted at the conclusion of the Legislative Forum on Saturday, January 6, 2007. At least a five-eighths majority vote of individual active members present (including multisport conference members in the governance structure) and voting shall be required to override the legislative action taken by the Board of Directors. The vote shall be based on the principle of one institution, one vote, and the vote shall be taken by roll call electronically. A “yes” vote will indicate support for the override. A “no” vote will indicate support for the action taken by the Board of Directors.

An override of the Board’s legislative action by vote of the membership shall be effective upon adjournment of the business session in which the vote occurs.

In order to designate a voting delegate, the following procedure is applicable:

- a. The Appointment of Delegate form is found on the 2007 NCAA Convention Web site.
- b. An institution’s president or chancellor (commissioner in case of a conference) must complete and submit the Appointment of Delegate form.
- c. An institution has discretion to select the delegate of its choice.
- d. In order to be appointed as a delegate, an individual must first be registered for the Convention.
- e. An e-mail will be automatically sent once a delegate has been assigned voting status.

NO. 2005-54

**ELIGIBILITY — GRADUATE STUDENT
OR POSTBACCALAUREATE
PARTICIPATION — TRANSFER
ELIGIBILITY**

Intent: To permit a student-athlete who is enrolled in a specific graduate degree program of an institution other than the institution from which he or she previously received a baccalaureate degree to participate in intercollegiate athletics, regardless of any previous transfer.

Bylaws: Amend 14.1.9, as follows:

“14.1.9 Graduate Student/Postbaccalaureate Participation. A student-athlete who is enrolled in a graduate or professional school of

the same institution from which he or she previously received a baccalaureate degree, a student-athlete who is enrolled and seeking a second baccalaureate or equivalent degree at the same institution or a student-athlete who has graduated and is continuing as a full-time student at the same institution while taking course work that would lead to the equivalent of another major or degree as defined and documented by the institution, may participate in intercollegiate athletics, provided the student has eligibility remaining and such participation occurs within the applicable five-year period set forth in Bylaw 14.2 (see also Bylaw 14.1.8.2.1.4).

“14.1.9.1 One-Time Transfer Exception. A graduate student who is enrolled in a graduate or professional school of an institution other than the institution from which he or she previously received a baccalaureate degree may participate in intercollegiate athletics if the student fulfills the conditions of the one-time transfer exception set forth in Bylaw 14.5.5.2.10 and has eligibility remaining per Bylaw 14.2. Graduate Student in Specific Degree Program Transfer Exception. A graduate student-athlete who is enrolled in a specific degree program in a graduate or professional school of an institution other than the institution from which he or she previously received a baccalaureate degree may participate in intercollegiate athletics, provided the student-athlete has eligibility remaining and such participation occurs within the applicable five-year period set forth in Bylaw 14.2 (see also Bylaw 14.1.8.2.1.4).”

[14.1.9.2 and 14.1.9.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division I Board of Directors [Management Council (Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet) (Subcommittee on Continuing Eligibility) (Ad Hoc Group to Study the One-Time Transfer Exception)].

Effective Date: Immediate

Proposal Category: Amendment

Topical Area: Eligibility

Rationale: This proposal would allow a student-athlete to enroll in a specific graduate degree program at an institution other than the one from which he or she earned a four-year degree and be immediately eligible for intercollegiate competition, provided the graduate student has remaining eligibility. A student-athlete who earned his or her undergraduate degree has achieved the primary goal of graduation and should be permitted to choose a graduate school that meets both his or her academic and athletics interests, regardless of his or her previous transfer history.

Position Statement(s):

Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet: The cabinet unanimously supports Proposal No. 2005-54. In the spirit of student-athlete well-being, student-athletes that complete their degrees

and have eligibility remaining should be able to transfer and enroll in the graduate program of their choice without NCAA transfer restrictions.

Estimated Budget Impact: None.

Impact on Student Athlete's Time: None.

History:

Jun 03, 2005 Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet, Recommends Approval
 Jun 24, 2005 Submit; Submitted for consideration.
 Sep 09, 2005 Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet; See position statement.
 Jan 08, 2006 Mgmt Council 1st Review, Approved - (Yea=37, Nay=14, Abstain=0, Not Present=0)
 Jan 08, 2006 Mgmt Council 1st Review, Approved; Amended to specify that the student-athlete must be enrolled in a specific graduate degree program. - (Yea=45, Nay=6, Abstain=0, Not Present=0)
 Jan 09, 2006 Board Consideration; Deferred Action until April 2006.
 Apr 27, 2006 Board Consideration, Adopted - (Yea=13, Nay=4, Abstain=0, Not Present=1)
 Apr 27, 2006 Adopted, Override Period; Start of Override Period
 Jun 26, 2006 Adopted, Override Period; End of Override Period; (Number of Override Request = 46)
 Jun 27, 2006 Board Review; Based on the number of override requests received, the Board of Directors will review its action on the proposal at its August 2006 meeting.
 Aug 03, 2006 Board Review; Upheld adoption. Override vote by Division I membership will occur during the Division I Legislative Forum scheduled for Saturday, January 6 at the 2007 NCAA Convention.

NO. 2005-128	PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — NUMBER OF CONTESTS — FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION
---------------------	--

Intent: In championship subdivision football, to permit an institution to compete annually in 12 regular-season contests.

Bylaws: Amend 17.11.5.1, as follows:

[Federated Provision, FCS only]

“17.11.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. In bowl subdivision football, a member institution shall limit its total regular-season playing schedule with outside competition during the permissible football playing season in any one year to 12 contests (games or scrimmages), except as provided for member institutions located in Alaska and Hawaii, under Bylaw 17.30.2, and except as provided for all members under Bylaw 17.11.5.2. In championship subdivision

football, a member institution shall limit its total regular-season playing schedule with outside competition during the permissible football playing season in any one year to 11 contests (games or scrimmages), except as provided for member institutions located in Alaska and Hawaii, under Bylaw 17.30.2, and except as provided for all members under Bylaw 17.11.5.2. Twelve football contests shall be permissible during those years in which there are 14 Saturdays from the first permissible playing date through the last playing date in November (2008, 2013, 2014 and 2019).

[17.11.5.1.1 unchanged.]

“17.11.5.1.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. In bowl subdivision football, an individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than 12 football contests. In championship subdivision football, an individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than 11 football contests, except that 12 football contests shall be permissible during those years in which there are 14 Saturdays from the first permissible playing date through the last playing date in November (2008, 2013, 2014 and 2019). This limitation includes those contests in which the student-athlete represents the institution in accordance with Bylaw 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution.”

Source: NCAA Division I Management Council [Championships/Competition Cabinet (Football Issues Committee) (Ohio Valley Conference)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Proposal Category: Amendment

Topical Area: Playing and Practice Seasons

Rationale: Currently, football championship subdivision institutions must limit their football regular-season playing schedule with outside competition to 11 contests some years and 12 contests in others, depending on the number of Saturdays between the first and last permissible playing dates. Permitting institutions to schedule 12 regular-season football games every year allows for greater consistency and provides additional competitive opportunities for football student-athletes. There would be no increase in the length of the regular playing season by adding permissible playing dates at either the start or the end of the current regular season. If an institution chooses to add a 12th game, the contest may be scheduled only on what otherwise would have been a “bye” date. Additionally, NCAA research regarding Division I football injury rates for seasons in which 12 football contests were permitted suggests that the rates in those seasons were in the same range as the rates in previous 11-game seasons.

Position Statement(s):

Championships/Competition Cabinet: Based on a recommendation from the Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee, the cabinet agreed to support the proposal as written.

Estimated Budget Impact: Varied with a potential positive impact on revenue generated.

Impact on Student Athlete's Time: None.

History:

Jul 14, 2005 Submit; Submitted for consideration.

Jul 21, 2005 Football Issues Committee, Recommends Approval; See position statement.

Sep 21, 2005 Championships/Competition Cabinet, Recommends Approval; See position statement.

Oct 13, 2005 Sponsor modified effective date from August 1, 2007 to August 1, 2006.

Jan 08, 2006 Mgmt Council 1st Review, Approved - (Yea=6, Nay=5, Abstain=1, Not Present=1)

Jan 09, 2006 Comment Period; Start of Comment Period

Mar 12, 2006 Comment Period; End of Comment Period; (Official Comment Totals: Support = 1, Oppose = 2, Abstain = 0)

Apr 10, 2006 Mgmt Council 2nd Review, Approved - (Yea=8, Nay=4, Abstain=0, Not Present=0)

Apr 27, 2006 Board Consideration, Defeated - (Yea=0, Nay=3, Abstain=0, Not Present=1)

Apr 27, 2006 Defeated, Override Period; Start of Override Period

Jun 26, 2006 Defeated, Override Period; End of Override Period; (Number of Override Request = 32)

Jun 27, 2006 Based on the number of override requests received, the Board of Directors will review its action on the proposal at its August 2006 meeting.

Aug 03, 2006 Board Review; Deferred consideration of the override request until October 2006.

Oct 26, 2006 Board Review; Upheld defeat. Override vote by the football championship subdivision membership will occur during the Division I business session scheduled for Saturday, January 6 at the 2007 NCAA Convention.

Pad #	School/Conference	Subdivision	2005-54 Override Adoption	2005-128 Override Defeat
1	Alabama A&M University	FCS		
2	Alabama State University	FCS	N	Y
3	Alcorn State University	FCS	N	Y
4	America East Conference	DI	N	
5	American University	DI	Y	
6	Appalachian State University	FCS	N	N
7	Arizona State University	FBS	Y	
8	Arkansas State University	FBS	Y	
9	Atlantic 10 Conference	FCS	N	N
10	Atlantic Coast Conference	FBS	N	
11	Atlantic Sun Conference	DI	N	
12	Auburn University	FBS	Y	
13	Austin Peay State University	FCS	Y	Y
14	Ball State University	FBS	Y	
15	Baylor University	FBS	Y	
16	Belmont University	DI	N	
17	Bethune-Cookman College	FCS		
18	Big 12 Conference	FBS	Y	
19	Big East Conference	FBS	Y	
20	Big Sky Conference	FCS	A	Y
21	Big South Conference	DI	N	
22	Big Ten Conference	FBS	Y	
23	Big West Conference	DI	N	
24	Birmingham-Southern College	DI		
25	Boise State University	FBS		
26	Boston College	FBS	Y	
27	Boston University	DI	N	
28	Bowling Green State University	FBS		
29	Bradley University	DI	Y	
30	Brigham Young University	FBS	Y	
31	Brown University	FCS	Y	N
32	Bucknell University	FCS	Y	N
33	Butler University	FCS	Y	N
34	California Polytechnic State University	FCS	N	Y
35	California State University- Fresno	FBS	N	
36	California State University- Fullerton	DI	Y	
37	California State University- Northridge	DI	Y	
38	California State University- Sacramento	FCS		
39	Campbell University	DI	Y	
40	Canisius College	DI	Y	
41	Centenary College (Louisiana)	DI		
42	Central Connecticut State University	FCS	Y	N
43	Central Michigan University	FBS		
44	Charleston Southern University	FCS	Y	N
45	Clemson University	FBS	N	
46	Cleveland State University	DI	Y	

47	Coastal Carolina University	FCS	Y	N
48	Colgate University	FCS	Y	Y
49	College of Charleston (South Carolina)	DI	Y	
50	College of the Holy Cross	FCS	Y	N
51	College of William and Mary	FCS	Y	N
52	Colonial Athletic Association	DI	Y	
53	Colorado State University	FBS		
54	Columbia University-Barnard College	FCS	Y	N
55	Conference USA	FBS	N	
56	Coppin State University	DI		
57	Cornell University	FCS	Y	N
58	Creighton University	DI		
59	Dartmouth College	FCS	Y	N
60	Davidson College	FCS	Y	N
61	Delaware State University	FCS	N	Y
62	DePaul University	DI	N	
63	Drake University	FCS	Y	Y
64	Drexel University	DI		
65	Duke University	FBS	Y	
66	Duquesne University	FCS	N	Y
67	East Carolina University	FBS		
68	East Tennessee State University	DI	Y	
69	Eastern Illinois University	FCS	Y	Y
70	Eastern Kentucky University	FCS	Y	Y
71	Eastern Michigan University	FBS	Y	
72	Eastern Washington University	FCS	Y	N
73	Elon University	FCS	Y	N
74	Fairfield University	DI	Y	
75	Fairleigh Dickinson University- Metropolitan	DI		
76	Florida A&M University	FCS		Y
77	Florida Atlantic University	FBS		
78	Florida International University	FBS	N	
79	Florida State University	FBS	N	
80	Fordham University	FCS	N	Y
81	Furman University	FCS	Y	N
82	Gardner-Webb University	FCS		
83	George Mason University	DI	Y	
84	George Washington University	DI	N	
85	Georgetown University	FCS	N	N
86	Georgia Institute of Technology	FBS		
87	Georgia Southern University	FCS	N	N
88	Georgia State University	DI	Y	
89	Gonzaga University	DI	Y	
90	Grambling State University	FCS	N	Y
91	Hampton University	FCS	N	Y
92	Harvard University	FCS	Y	N
93	High Point University	DI	Y	
94	Hofstra University	FCS	N	N
95	Horizon League	DI	Y	

96	Howard University	FCS		
97	Idaho State University	FCS	N	Y
98	Illinois State University	FCS	Y	Y
99	Indiana State University	FCS	Y	Y
100	Indiana University- Bloomington	FBS	N	
101	Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis	DI	Y	
102	Indiana University-Purdue University- Fort Wayne	DI	Y	
103	Iona College	FCS	Y	N
104	Iowa State University	FBS	N	
105	Ivy Group	FCS	Y	N
106	Jackson State University	FCS		
107	Jacksonville State University	FCS	Y	Y
108	Jacksonville University	FCS	Y	Y
109	James Madison University	FCS	Y	N
110	Kansas State University	FBS	N	
111	Kent State University	FBS	Y	
112	La Salle University	FCS	Y	N
113	Lafayette College	FCS	Y	N
114	Lamar University	DI	Y	
115	Lehigh University	FCS	Y	N
116	Liberty University	FCS	Y	N
117	Lipscomb University	DI		
118	Long Beach State University	DI		
119	Long Island University-Brooklyn Campus	DI	Y	
120	Louisiana State University	FBS	N	
121	Louisiana Tech University	FBS		
122	Loyola College (Maryland)	DI	Y	
123	Loyola Marymount University	DI		
124	Loyola University (Illinois)	DI	Y	
125	Manhattan College	DI	Y	
126	Marist College	FCS	Y	N
127	Marquette University	DI	Y	
128	Marshall University	FBS	Y	
129	McNeese State University	FCS		
130	Mercer University	DI		
131	Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	DI	Y	
132	Miami University (Ohio)	FBS		
133	Michigan State University	FBS	Y	
134	Mid-American Conference	FBS	Y	
135	Mid-Continent Conference	DI	Y	
136	Middle Tennessee State University	FBS		
137	Mid-Eastern Athletic Conf.	FCS	N	Y
138	Mississippi State University	FBS	N	
139	Mississippi Valley State University	FCS	N	Y
140	Missouri State University	FCS	Y	Y
141	Missouri Valley Conference	DI	Y	
142	Monmouth University	FCS	Y	N
143	Montana State University-Bozeman	FCS	Y	Y

144	Morehead State University	FCS	Y	Y
145	Morgan State University	FCS		
146	Mount St. Mary's University	DI	Y	
147	Mountain West Conference	FBS	Y	
148	Murray State University	FCS	Y	Y
149	New Mexico State University	FBS	N	
150	Niagara University	DI	Y	
151	Nicholls State University	FCS		
152	Norfolk State University	FCS	Y	Y
153	North Carolina A&T State University	FCS		
154	North Carolina State University	FBS	N	
155	Northeast Conference	FCS	Y	N
156	Northeastern University	FCS	Y	N
157	Northern Arizona University	FCS	Y	N
158	Northern Illinois University	FBS		
159	Northwestern State University	FCS	Y	Y
160	Northwestern University	FBS	Y	
161	Oakland University	DI	Y	
162	Ohio State University	FBS	Y	
163	Ohio University	FBS		
164	Ohio Valley Conference	FCS	Y	Y
165	Oklahoma State University	FBS	Y	
166	Old Dominion University	DI	Y	
167	Oral Roberts University	DI	Y	
168	Oregon State University	FBS	N	
169	Pacific-10 Conference	FBS	N	
170	Pennsylvania State University	FBS	Y	
171	Pepperdine University	DI	Y	
172	Portland State University	FCS		
173	Prairie View A&M University	FCS		
174	Princeton University	FCS	Y	N
175	Providence College	DI	N	
176	Purdue University	FBS		
177	Quinnipiac University	DI		
178	Radford University	DI	N	
179	Rice University	FBS		
180	Rider University	DI	Y	
181	Robert Morris University	FCS		
182	Rutgers- State Univ of New Jersey- New Brunswick	FBS	N	
183	Sacred Heart University	FCS	N	N
184	Saint Francis University (Pennsylvania)	FCS		
185	Saint Joseph's University	DI	Y	
186	Saint Louis University	DI		
187	Sam Houston State University	FCS		
188	Samford University	FCS	N	Y
189	San Diego State University	FBS	Y	
190	San Jose State University	FBS	N	
191	Santa Clara University	DI		

192	Savannah State University	FCS	N	Y
193	Seton Hall University	DI	Y	
194	Siena College	DI	Y	
195	South Carolina State University	FCS		
196	Southeast Missouri State University	FCS	Y	Y
197	Southeastern Conference	FBS	A	
198	Southeastern Louisiana University	FCS	Y	Y
199	Southern Conference	FCS	Y	N
200	Southern Illinois University at Carbondale	FCS	Y	Y
201	Southern Methodist University	FBS	Y	
202	Southern University- Baton Rouge	FCS		
203	Southern Utah University	FCS	Y	N
204	Southland Conference	FCS	Y	Y
205	Southwestern Athletic Conf.	FCS	Y	Y
206	St. Bonaventure University	DI	Y	
207	St. Francis College (New York)	DI	N	
208	St. John's University (New York)	DI	N	
209	St. Mary's College of California	DI		
210	St. Peter's College	FCS	Y	N
211	Stanford University	FBS	Y	
212	State University of New York at Binghamton	DI	Y	
213	Stephen F. Austin State University	FCS	N	Y
214	Stetson University	DI	N	
215	Stony Brook University	FCS		
216	Sun Belt Conference	FBS	Y	
217	Syracuse University	FBS	Y	
218	Temple University	FBS	N	
219	Tennessee State University	FCS	Y	Y
220	Tennessee Technological University	FCS	Y	Y
221	Texas A&M University- College Station	FBS	Y	
222	Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi	DI	Y	
223	Texas Christian University	FBS	Y	
224	Texas Southern University	FCS		Y
225	Texas State University-San Marcos	FCS	N	Y
226	Texas Tech University	FBS	Y	
227	The Citadel	FCS	N	Y
228	The Patriot League	FCS	Y	N
229	Towson University	FCS	N	N
230	Troy University	FBS	N	
231	Tulane University	FBS		
232	U.S. Air Force Academy	FBS		
233	U.S. Military Academy	FBS	Y	
234	U.S. Naval Academy	FBS	Y	
235	University at Albany	FCS	Y	Y
236	University at Buffalo- the State University of New	FBS	N	
237	University of Akron	FBS	N	
238	University of Alabama at Birmingham	FBS	N	
239	University of Alabama- Tuscaloosa	FBS		

240	University of Arizona	FBS	Y	
241	University of Arkansas- Fayetteville	FBS	Y	
242	University of Arkansas- Little Rock	DI		
243	University of Arkansas- Pine Bluff	FCS		
244	University of California- Berkeley	FBS		
245	University of California- Irvine	DI	N	
246	University of California- Los Angeles	FBS	Y	
247	University of California- Riverside	DI	Y	
248	University of California- Santa Barbara	DI	Y	
249	University of Central Florida	FBS	Y	
250	University of Cincinnati	FBS	N	
251	University of Colorado- Boulder	FBS	Y	
252	University of Connecticut	FBS	Y	
253	University of Dayton	FCS	Y	N
254	University of Delaware	FCS	Y	N
255	University of Denver	DI	Y	
256	University of Detroit Mercy	DI	Y	
257	University of Evansville	DI	Y	
258	University of Florida	FBS	Y	
259	University of Georgia	FBS	Y	
260	University of Hartford	DI	Y	
261	University of Hawaii- Manoa	FBS	N	
262	University of Houston	FBS		
263	University of Idaho	FBS		
264	University of Illinois at Chicago	DI	N	
265	University of Illinois- Champaign	FBS	Y	
266	University of Iowa	FBS	N	
267	University of Kansas	FBS	Y	
268	University of Kentucky	FBS	Y	
269	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	FBS		
270	University of Louisiana at Monroe	FBS		
271	University of Louisville	FBS	Y	
272	University of Maine- Orono	FCS	N	N
273	University of Maryland- Baltimore County	DI		
274	University of Maryland- College Park	FBS	N	
275	University of Maryland- Eastern Shore	DI	N	
276	University of Massachusetts- Amherst	FCS	N	N
277	University of Memphis	FBS	Y	
278	University of Miami (Florida)	FBS	N	
279	University of Michigan	FBS	Y	
280	University of Minnesota- Twin Cities	FBS		
281	University of Mississippi	FBS		
282	University of Missouri- Columbia	FBS	Y	
283	University of Missouri- Kansas City	DI	Y	
284	University of Montana	FCS	Y	Y
285	University of Nebraska- Lincoln	FBS	N	
286	University of Nevada	FBS	N	
287	University of Nevada- Las Vegas	FBS	Y	
288	University of New Hampshire	FCS	Y	N

289	University of New Mexico	FBS	Y	
290	University of New Orleans	DI		
291	University of North Carolina- Asheville	DI	Y	
292	University of North Carolina at Greensboro	DI	Y	
293	University of North Carolina- Chapel Hill	FBS	Y	
294	University of North Carolina- Charlotte	DI	N	
295	University of North Carolina- Wilmington	DI	Y	
296	University of North Texas	FBS	Y	
297	University of Northern Iowa	FCS		
298	University of Notre Dame	FBS	Y	
299	University of Oklahoma	FBS	Y	
300	University of Oregon	FBS	N	
301	University of Pennsylvania	FCS	Y	N
302	University of Pittsburgh	FBS	Y	
303	University of Portland	DI	Y	
304	University of Rhode Island	FCS	N	N
305	University of Richmond	FCS		
306	University of San Diego	FCS	Y	Y
307	University of San Francisco	DI	N	
308	University of South Alabama	DI		
309	University of South Carolina- Columbia	FBS	Y	
310	University of South Florida	FBS	Y	
311	University of Southern California	FBS	N	
312	University of Southern Mississippi	FBS		
313	University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	FCS	Y	Y
314	University of Tennessee at Martin	FCS	Y	Y
315	University of Tennessee- Knoxville	FBS	N	
316	University of Texas at Arlington	DI	Y	
317	University of Texas at Austin	FBS	Y	
318	University of Texas at El Paso	FBS	Y	
319	University of Texas at San Antonio	DI		
320	University of Texas- Pan American	DI	Y	
321	University of the Pacific	DI	Y	
322	University of Toledo	FBS		
323	University of Tulsa	FBS	Y	
324	University of Utah	FBS	Y	
325	University of Vermont	DI	N	
326	University of Virginia	FBS		
327	University of Washington	FBS	N	
328	University of Wisconsin- Green Bay	DI	Y	
329	University of Wisconsin- Madison	FBS	Y	
330	University of Wisconsin- Milwaukee	DI	Y	
331	University of Wyoming	FBS		
332	Utah State University	FBS	Y	
333	Valparaiso University	FCS	Y	N
334	Vanderbilt University	FBS		
335	Villanova University	FCS	Y	N
336	Virginia Commonwealth University	DI		
337	Virginia Military Institute	FCS	Y	N

	Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State			
338	University	FBS	Y	
339	Wagner College	FCS	N	N
340	Wake Forest University	FBS	Y	
341	Washington State University	FBS		
342	Weber State University	FCS	Y	Y
343	West Coast Conference	DI	Y	
344	West Virginia University	FBS	Y	
345	Western Athletic Conference	FBS	N	
346	Western Carolina University	FCS	N	N
347	Western Illinois University	FCS		
348	Western Kentucky University	FCS	Y	N
349	Western Michigan University	FBS		
350	Wichita State University	DI	Y	
351	Winthrop University	DI	Y	
352	Wofford College	FCS	N	N
353	Wright State University	DI	Y	
354	Xavier University	DI	N	
355	Yale University	FCS	Y	N
356	Youngstown State University	FCS	Y	Y
357	Gateway Football Conference	FCS		Y

Totals:

Y	130	196	50
N	127	83	55
A	100	2	0
NP		76	252

Action:

PASSED DEFEATED

101st Annual Convention

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

SUBMITTED BY THE MEMBERSHIP

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words that appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words that appear in **bold face** are to be added. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 2006-07 NCAA Division II Manual.]

DIVISION II LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

The NCAA Division II Presidents Council has determined that it will deal primarily with those national issues in Division II athletics that prompt widespread concern among Division II presidents or chancellors.

Legislative proposals developed by the Division II Management Council or by Division II committees reporting to it must be submitted to the Division II Presidents Council for review. They cannot be placed on the agenda for consideration at the Convention unless the Presidents Council agrees to sponsor them. This procedure was established to affirm presidential control of intercollegiate athletics in Division II.

The Division II Presidents Council has identified those proposals that it believes are of particular interest to Division II presidents or chancellors and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping. It should be noted, however, that inclusion of proposals in the Presidents Council grouping does not necessarily constitute a position by the Division II Presidents Council for or against a proposal. Those proposals with an asterisk before the proposal number have been identified by the Presidents Council as roll-call votes. Delegates should refer to each proposal's source line for information regarding the sponsor of each proposal.

[Note: Pursuant to Constitution 5.3.12, all amendments shall become effective not earlier than the first day of August following adoption at the NCAA Convention; however, if a voting delegate wishes to propose an immediate effective date, or to propose any other effective date prior to the first day of August, a two-thirds majority of all delegates present and eligible to vote on the amendment is required to approve the immediate or alternative effective date. Those proposals that receive the required vote to carry an immediate effective date and that are adopted, become effective upon adjournment of the Convention.]

DIVISION II LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

CONSENT PACKAGE

NO. 1 (NO. 2-15) ELIGIBILITY — PROGRESS TOWARD DEGREE AND TRANSFERS — TWO-YEAR NONPARTICIPATION OR MINIMAL PARTICIPATION EXCEPTION

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to use the two-year nonparticipation exception to the progress-toward-degree requirements or the transfer residency requirement, provided he or she has not competed in intercollegiate competition and has not engaged in other countable athletically related activities in intercollegiate athletics beyond a 14 consecutive calendar day period, which begins with the date on which the student-athlete first engages in countable activities.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.4.3.4, pages 126-127, as follows:

“14.4.3.4 Exceptions to Progress-Toward-Degree Rule

[14.4.3.4-(a) through 14.4.3.4-(d) unchanged.]

“(e) Two-Year Nonparticipation or Minimal Participation Exception. A student-athlete may qualify for an exception to the application of the progress-toward-degree regulation(s) if, for a consecutive two-year period immediately before the date on which the student begins participation (countable athletically related activities), the student-athlete has not **competed and has not** participated in **other** countable athletically related activities (see Bylaw 17.02.1.1) in any sport *in intercollegiate competition beyond a 14 consecutive calendar day period*, or has not participated in organized noncollegiate amateur competition while enrolled as a full-time student in a collegiate institution; and is otherwise eligible under all institutional, conference and NCAA rules. **The 14 consecutive calendar day period begins with the date on which the student-athlete first engages in any countable athletically related activity.** ~~This~~**The** two-year period does not include any period of time before the student-athlete’s initial collegiate enrollment. The student-athlete’s eligibility in future seasons would be governed by the provisions of the progress-toward-degree rule, which would be applied from the beginning of the first term the student-athlete began participation.”

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.5.4.4.3, page 131, as follows:

“14.5.4.4.3 Two-Year Nonparticipation or Minimal Participation Exception. The student transfers to the certifying institution from a two-year college and, for a consecutive two-year period immediately before the date on which the student begins participation (countable athletically related activities), the student has not **competed and has not** participated in **other** countable athleti-

cally related activities (see Bylaw 17.02.1.1) in the involved sport *in intercollegiate competition beyond a 14 consecutive calendar day period*, or has not participated in organized noncollegiate amateur competition while enrolled as a full-time student in a collegiate institution. **The 14 consecutive calendar day period begins with the date on which the student-athlete first engages in any countable athletically related activity.** ~~This~~**The** two-year period does not include any period of time before the student’s initial collegiate enrollment.”

C. Bylaws: Amend 14.5.5.3.7, page 133, as follows:

“14.5.5.3.7 Two-Year Nonparticipation or Minimal Participation Exception. The student transfers to the certifying institution from another four-year college and, for a consecutive two-year period immediately before the date on which the student begins participation (countable athletically related activities), the student has not **competed and has not** participated in **other** countable athletically related activities (see Bylaw 17.02.1.1) in the involved sport *in intercollegiate competition beyond a 14 consecutive calendar day period*, or has not participated in organized noncollegiate amateur competition while enrolled as a full-time student in a collegiate institution. **The 14 consecutive calendar day period begins with the date on which the student-athlete first engages in any countable athletically related activity.** ~~This~~**The** two-year period does not include any period of time before the student’s initial collegiate enrollment.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate, for any progress-toward-degree certification or transfer on or after August 1, 2006.

Rationale: The expansion of the two-year nonparticipation exception addresses frequent waiver requests received by the NCAA Division II Management Council Administrative Review Subcommittee for student-athletes who have triggered a transfer year in residence by participating in a minimal amount of countable athletically related activities but not competition. This recommendation supports student-athlete well-being and lessens bureaucracy by alleviating the need to file waivers for these circumstances. Moreover, there is no unfair competitive advantage, as competition remains excluded from the exception. Further, the membership adopted a two-year nonparticipation exception at the 2005 NCAA Convention for the progress-toward-degree requirements. To ensure the exceptions are consistent, it makes sense to add this expansion to both the progress-toward-degree exception and the transfer exceptions. This proposal has an immediate effective date for any progress-toward-degree certification or transfer on or after August 1, 2006. The effective date will allow all student-athletes using the exception in the 2006-07 academic year to benefit from the proposed change.

NO. 2 (NO. 2-16) ELIGIBILITY — TRANSFER RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT — CHAMPIONSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete who is required to fulfill an academic year of residence is not eligible to participate in any NCAA championship during the vacation period immediately following the academic year of residence.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.1.4, page 128, as follows:

*“14.5.1.4 **Championship** Eligibility for *Championship in Progress*. A transfer student shall be eligible for any NCAA championship that is in progress after a full calendar year has elapsed and at the time he or she has completed two full semesters or three quarters of academic work who is required to fulfill an academic year of residence shall not be eligible to participate in any NCAA championship that occurs during the vacation period immediately following the academic year of residence.”*

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: The intent of the transfer residence requirement is for a student-athlete to be withheld from all competition for one full academic year. It is not appropriate for a student-athlete to be eligible for NCAA championships that occur during the vacation period immediately following the conclusion of the transfer residence requirement, since that championship was tied to a season during which the individual was not eligible for other competition.

NO. 3 (NO. 2-19) ELIGIBILITY — TRANSFERS — FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS — NONRECRUITED STUDENT EXCEPTION

Intent: To permit a four-year college transfer student-athlete to use the nonrecruited student exception to the transfer residency requirement, provided he or she has not competed for any previous institution and has not engaged in countable athletically related activities in intercollegiate athletics at any previous institution beyond a 14 consecutive calendar day period, which begins with the date on which the student-athlete first engages in countable activities.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.5.3.9, page 133, as follows:

“14.5.5.3.9 Nonrecruited Student Exception. The student transfers to the certifying institution, and the following conditions are met:

[14.5.5.3.9-(a) through 14.5.5.3.9-(b) unchanged.]

*“(c) The student-athlete has not **competed for any previous***

*institution and has not participated in countable athletically related activities (see Bylaw 17.02.1.1) in intercollegiate athletics **beyond a 14 consecutive calendar day period at any previous institution before transfer, except that a student may have participated in limited preseason tryouts. The 14 consecutive calendar day period begins with the date on which the student-athlete first engages in any countable athletically related activity.”***

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate, for any transfer occurring on or after August 1, 2006.

Rationale: The expansion of the “nonrecruited student exception” addresses waiver requests received by the NCAA Division II Management Council Administrative Review Subcommittee for student-athletes who have triggered a transfer year in residence by participating in a minimal amount of countable athletically related activities but not competition. This recommendation supports student-athlete well-being and lessens bureaucracy by alleviating the need for waivers under these circumstances. Moreover, there is no unfair competitive advantage since it does not allow for competition at any previous institution. The proposed effective date would be immediate for any four-year college transfer student using the exception on or after August 1, 2006. This effective date will allow all student-athletes transferring in the 2006-07 academic year to benefit from the proposed change.

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL GROUPING

***NO. 4 (NO. 2-1) NCAA MEMBERSHIP — DIVISION II MEMBERSHIP — MEMBERSHIP PROCESS — PROVISIONAL AND RECLASSIFYING INSTITUTIONS**

Intent: To establish a uniform membership process for provisional and reclassifying institutions seeking to become active members of Division II, as follows: (1) Require sponsorship by an active Division II member or conference; and, (2) Establish a two-part membership process, consisting of an exploratory period and a provisional period, which must be completed prior to receiving an invitation to active membership status.

A. Constitution: Amend 3.02.3.2, page 7, as follows:
[Roll Call]

“3.02.3.2 Provisional Member. A provisional member is a four-year college or university or a two-year upper-level collegiate institution accredited by the appropriate regional accrediting agency and that has applied for active membership in the Association. Provisional membership is a prerequisite for active membership

in the Association. The institution shall be elected to provisional membership under the provisions of this article (see Constitution 3.6.3). Provisional members shall receive all publications and mailings received by active members in addition to other privileges designated in the constitution and bylaws of the Association. *Provisional membership is limited to a four-year period. For specific requirements, see Bylaw 20.3.*

B. Bylaws: Amend 20.3, pages 276-278, as follows:

[Roll Call]

“20.3 PROVISIONAL DIVISION II MEMBERSHIP PROCESS

“20.3.1 Provisional Membership Eligibility

“20.3.1.1 Types of Institutions. Provisional membership is available to four-year colleges and universities and two-year upper-level collegiate institutions, accredited by the appropriate regional accrediting agency and duly elected to provisional membership under the provisions of Constitution 3.6.3 and Bylaw 20.3.

“20.3.1.1.1 Four-Year Provision. *Provisional membership shall be limited to a four-year period. At the end of the four-year period (except when institutions are required to repeat one year per 3.6.5.1), a provisional member shall be eligible to apply for active membership (see Constitution 3.2.3).*

“20.3.1.1.1.1 Exploratory Period. *An institution may apply for provisional membership after completing a one-year exploratory period. The president or chancellor of the institution shall submit written notice of the institution’s desire to begin the exploratory period. The notice shall be received in the national office (by mail) not later than June 1 one year before the June 1 application deadline when the institution desires to apply for provisional membership. A nonrefundable exploratory fee in the amount of \$1,000 shall accompany the written notice.*

“20.3.1.2 Compliance with Association Rules. *A provisional member shall administer its athletics program in accordance with the constitution, bylaws and other legislation of the Association.*

“20.3.1.2.1 Four-Year Progression. *During the provisional membership process an institution shall administer its athletics program in accordance with the constitution, bylaws and other legislation of the Association.*

“20.3.1.2.1.1 Credit for Time Completed Previously as a Provisional Member. *The Membership Committee, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant credit to an institution for any portion of the first two*

years of the four-year provisional membership period, or components of the requirements of such years, the institution previously completed a provisional members, provided the portion or component was completed within the last 10 years.

“20.3.1.2.2 Transfer of Provisional Membership from Division I or III to Division II. *The Division II Management Council may waive one year of the four-year provisional membership period, if an institution transfers its provisional membership from Division I or III to Division II. The institution shall serve a minimum of four total years of provisional membership before being considered for active membership.*

“20.3.1.3 Standards. *The institution’s athletics programs shall reflect the establishment and maintenance of high standards of personal honor, eligibility and fair play.*

“20.3.1.4 Minimum Sports-Sponsorship Requirement. *For a provisional membership application to be considered, the institution shall provide information indicating intent to sponsor, during the first year of provisional membership, the minimum number of sports required for Division II membership as set forth in 20.10.3.*

“20.3.1.5 Three-Season Requirement. *For a provisional membership application to be considered, at least one sport involving an all-female team shall be conducted in each sport season (i.e., fall, winter and spring). An institution may use a sport to meet the three-season requirement only if the institution has met the minimum contest and participants requirements for sports sponsorship in that sport as set forth in Bylaw 20.10.3.5.*

“20.3.1.6 Minimum Financial Aid Requirement. *For a provisional membership application to be considered, the institution shall annually provide financial assistance that equals one of the following:*

“(a) *A minimum of 50 percent of the maximum allowable equivalencies in a minimum of four separate sports, at least two of which must be women’s sports;*

“(b) *A minimum total expenditure of \$250,000 in athletically related financial aid, with at least \$125,000 in women’s sports. The athletics aid must be awarded in a minimum of four separate sports, at least two of which must be women’s sports; or*

“(c) *A minimum of 20 total full-equivalency grants, with at least 10 total full-equivalency grants in women’s sports. The grants must be awarded in a minimum of four separate sports, at least two of which must be women’s sports.*

“20.3.1.6.1 Counting Financial Aid Awards to Satisfy Minimum Requirements. *In counting financial*

aid awarded to student-athletes to determine if the requirements set forth in Constitution 3.6.1.6 have been satisfied, the institution must satisfy the following:

- “(a) Only countable financial aid, as set forth on the NCAA financial aid squad list form, may be used to meet the appropriate minimum;
- “(b) Countable financial aid awarded to a student-athlete who has exhausted eligibility or awarded to a medically exempt student-athlete may be used to meet the appropriate minimum;
- “(c) To be included in reaching the appropriate minimum, the financial aid actually must be awarded; and
- “(d) Countable aid awarded in emerging sports for women and non-NCAA sports may not be used to meet the appropriate minimum.

“20.3.1.6.1.2 *Single-Gender Programs.* Institutions that sponsor and conduct athletics programs for only one gender must award at least one-half of the minimum requirements set forth in Constitution 3.6.1.6-(a)-(c).

“20.3.1.6.1.3 *Waiver Minimum Financial Aid Requirement.* The Membership Committee, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may waive the minimum financial aid requirements for Division II membership based on objective evidence that demonstrates circumstances that warrant the waiver of the normal application of the legislation.

“20.3.1.7 *Annual Limit on Provisional Member Institutions.* The Management Council, based on the recommendation of the Membership Committee, may establish an annual limit on the number of eligible institutions that will be selected to begin the four-year provisional membership on September 1 following selection. Only those institutions that satisfy all applicable requirements set forth in Constitution 3.5 will be considered for selection.

“20.3.2 *Conditions and Obligations of Provisional Membership*

“20.3.21.12 **General Conditions and Obligations of Provisional Membership.** A provisional member shall administer its athletics program in accordance with the constitution, bylaws and other legislation of the Association.

“20.3.2.2 *Self-Study and Annual Review.* During the first year of provisional membership, a provisional member shall complete a comprehensive institutional self-

study and evaluation of the member's intercollegiate athletics program (Constitution 6.3.1.2 requires an institution recently granted active membership status to conduct a comprehensive self-study and evaluation of its intercollegiate athletics program not later than the end of the first year of active membership). A provisional member also shall provide, on an annual basis, a written report to be reviewed by the Membership Committee describing the institution's progress in meeting active membership requirements. The annual report shall be postmarked not later than June 1 each year. The annual report shall be completed in accordance with the requirements set forth in the Division II Educational Assessment Program.

“20.3.2.3 *Educational Assessment Program.* Each provisional member must complete the provisional members educational program prior to being granted active membership.

“20.3.2.4 *Coaches Certification.* During the third and fourth years of provisional membership, coaches of provisional members shall be certified to recruit off campus per Bylaw 11.5.

“20.3.5 *Determination of Provisional Membership Standing*

“20.3.5.1 *Failure to Meet Provisional Membership Requirements.* A provisional member failing to meet and maintain the conditions set forth in Constitution 3.6.4 may be required to repeat a year of provisional membership (with or without conditions), placed in corresponding membership or have its membership terminated, by a two-thirds vote of the Membership Committee members present and voting. A notice of intention to terminate membership, starting the grounds on which such an action will be based, shall be given in writing to the president or chancellor of the provisional member institution.

“20.3.5.1.1 *Repeat of Provisional Membership.* The Membership Committee, by a two-thirds majority of members present and voting, may require a provisional member to repeat any one of the four years of the provisional membership period. An institution may repeat one of the four years only one time during the four-year provisional membership period.

“20.3.5.1.2 *Waiver.* An institution may appeal to the Membership Committee for a waiver of the provisional member educational assessment program requirements (see Constitution 3.6.4.3) based on a failure to meet the requirements due to circumstances beyond the control of the institution. Such an appeal must be filed before June 1 after the academic year in which the institution failed to fulfill the requirements.

“20.3.5.1.3 Membership Committee Jurisdiction. Decisions made by the Membership Committee in regard to an institution’s standing as a provisional member are final.

“20.3.5.1.3.1 Authority of Management Council. The Management Council shall hear and act on an institution’s appeal of a decision made by the Membership Committee in regard to an institution’s standing as a provisional member.

“20.3.5.2 Termination. All rights and privileges of the provisional member shall cease on any termination of provisional membership. Any provisional member whose membership is terminated may reapply for provisional membership after a period of one year.

“20.3.5.3 Cessation of Rights and Privileges. All rights and privileges of provisional member shall cease on any termination of provisional membership.

“20.3.5.4 Discipline of Member Conference. During the provisional member’s compliance period, disciplinary or corrective actions other than termination of membership may be effected on a member conference that contains provisional members that fail to fulfill conditions and obligations of provisional membership.

“20.3.2 Division II Membership Process — Provisional and Reclassifying Institutions. Institutions seeking to become active members of Division II in all sports must successfully complete all requirements of the Division II membership process, as specified in Bylaw 20.3.

“20.3.2.1 Application and Sponsorship. An institution applying for Division II membership shall complete an application signed by the president or chancellor and be received in the national office not later than June 1. An applicant institution must be sponsored by an active member institution or conference. A nonrefundable application fee shall accompany the application form. The amount of the fee will be determined annually by the Membership Committee based on a continual analysis of expenses associated with the member educational assessment program. The Management Council, on recommendation of the Membership Committee, may establish an annual limit on the number of eligible institutions that will be selected to begin the membership process.

“20.3.2.2 Exploratory Period. Once an institution receives notice that it has been accepted to begin the Division II membership process, the institu-

tion shall enter the exploratory period. The exploratory period shall be a minimum of two years. At the completion of the two-year period, the institution shall receive an assessment of its readiness to proceed to the provisional period.

“20.3.2.2.1 Educational Assessment Program — Exploratory Period. Institutions are required to complete the following educational activities during the exploratory period:

“(a) Year One:

“(1) A visit paid by the institution to an active member institution’s campus, as selected by the Membership Committee;

“(2) A Division II Institutional Self-Study Guide (ISSG);

“(3) Demonstrated involvement and commitment of the president or chancellor at the institution in the membership process, as determined by the Membership Committee;

“(4) An on-campus assessment conducted by an outside group to review the readiness of the institution to become an active member, as measured against a Division II active member’s athletics program as selected by the Membership Committee; and

“(5) An annual report submitted by June 1, which shall include the completed Institutional Self-Study Guide (ISSG) and an athletics department strategic plan.

“(b) Year Two:

“(1) An on-campus assessment conducted by the Membership Committee to review progress;

“(2) An annual report submitted by June 1, including an update on Institutional Self-Study Guide action items and the athletics department strategic plan; and

“(3) Demonstrated involvement and commitment of the president or chancellor at the institution in the membership process, as determined by the Membership Committee.

“20.3.2.3 Provisional Period. After successful completion of the exploratory period, an institution will be invited to enter the provisional

period of the membership process. During the provisional period, an institution's readiness to become an active member institution will continue to be evaluated. The length of the provisional period will vary depending on an institution's readiness to become an active member institution; however, in no event shall the provisional period be less than one year. A nonrefundable member education fee will be assessed if an institution is invited to provisional membership. The amount of the fee will be determined annually by the Membership Committee, based on a continual analysis of expenses associated with the new member process. Additionally, a check in the appropriate amount for annual dues (see the current annual dues for active members per Constitution 3.7.3) also shall accompany the notice. The Management Council, on recommendation of the Membership Committee, may establish an annual limit on the number of eligible institutions that will be invited to begin the provisional period.

"20.3.2.3.1 Educational Assessment Program — Provisional Period. Institutions are required to complete the following educational activities during the provisional period:

- "(a) Demonstrated administration of its athletics program in accordance with the constitution, bylaws and other legislation of the Association;**
- "(b) Demonstrated involvement and commitment of the president or chancellor at the institution in the membership process, as determined by the Membership Committee;**
- "(c) An on-campus assessment conducted by an outside group to review the readiness of the institution to become an active member through the use of a compliance review and progress since the exploratory period assessment. Based on the reports, the institution may be invited to active membership; and**
- "(d) An annual report submitted by June 1.**

"20.3.2.4 Membership Committee Jurisdiction. Decisions made by the Membership Committee in regard to an institution's standing as an exploratory or provisional member are final.

"20.3.2.4.1 Authority of Management Council. The Management Council shall hear and act on an institution's appeal of a decision made by the Membership Committee in regard to an institution's standing as an exploratory or provisional member."

C. Bylaws: Amend 20.5, pages 279-282, as follows:

[Roll Call]

"20.5 CHANGE OF DIVISION MEMBERSHIP (ALL SPORTS)

"20.5.1 Requesting Reclassification Process. An institution that is currently an active member of Division I or Division III and seeks to reclassify its divisional membership in all sports to Division II, must successfully complete the membership process specified in Bylaw 20.3.2 in order to obtain active member status within Division II.

"20.5.1.1 Exploratory Year. An institution petitioning for change of division membership and desiring to become a member of Division II must complete a one-year exploratory period. When petitioning for change of division membership, a member shall notify the NCAA Division II Membership Committee on a form approved by the committee. The form shall be received in the national office (by mail) not later than June 1 prior to the academic year that the institution begins its one-year exploratory period. Immediately following the completion of the exploratory period, the institution may apply to begin the reclassification process if all application requirements set forth in Bylaw 20.5 are satisfied. Institutions seeking a waiver of the exploratory year should refer to the requirements in Bylaw 20.5.3.2.

"20.5.1.2 Reclassification to Division II from Division I — Notification Requirement. When petitioning for change of division membership, a member shall notify the Division II Membership Committee of its intent to begin the reclassification process on a form approved by the committee. The form shall be received in the national office (by mail) not later than June 1 prior to the academic year that the institution begins its reclassification process.

"20.5.1.2.1 Application Fee. A nonrefundable application fee shall accompany the application form. The amount of the fee will be determined annually by the Management Council based on a continual analysis of expenses associated with the reclassifying member educational assessment program.

"20.5.1.3 Reclassification to Division II from Divisions I or III — Sports-Sponsorship Requirement. For a reclassifying membership application to be considered, the institution shall provide information indicating intent to

sponsor, during the first year of the reclassifying process, the minimum number of sports required for Division II membership as set forth in Bylaw 20.10.3.

“20.5.1.4 Three-Season Requirement. For a reclassifying membership application to be considered, at least one sport involving an all-male team or a mixed team of males and females and at least one sport involving an all-female team shall be conducted in each sport season (i.e., fall, winter and spring). An institution may use a sport to meet the three-season requirement only if the institution has met the minimum contest and participants requirements for sports sponsorship in that sport as set forth in Bylaw 20.10.3.5.

“20.5.1.5 Minimal Financial Aid Requirements. For a reclassifying membership application to be considered, the institution shall provide information indicating intent to provide, during the first year of the reclassifying period, financial aid to student-athletes in an amount equal to or greater than the minimum requirements set forth in Bylaw 20.10.1.2.

“20.5.2 Reclassification Period and Requirements

“20.5.2.1 Two-Year Reclassification Period. If the reclassifying member has met all applicable Division II membership criteria and has complied for the two years before June 1 with all other Division II legislation, the member shall be transferred to Division II effective September 1 of the year that the institution selects as its effective date. Those institutions accepted for reclassification must be in compliance with all Division II legislation during both years of the reclassification period, including the minimum financial aid requirements and use of the Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse.

“20.5.2.1.1 Waiver. The Division II Membership Committee, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant waivers of the reclassifying-period provisions of Bylaw 20.5.2.1 if it deems that unusual circumstances warrant such action.

“20.5.2.2 Educational Assessment Program — Requirement. During the two-year reclassification compliance period, an institution shall complete an educational assessment program, established by the Division II Membership Committee, in order to be eligible for active membership in Division II. Institutions are required to complete the educational activities during the two-year reclassification compliance period prior to being granted Division II membership.

“20.5.2.2.1 Waiver. An institution may appeal to the Division II Membership Committee for a waiver of

the reclassifying member educational assessment program requirements based on a failure to meet the requirements due to circumstances beyond the control of the institution. Such an appeal must be filed before June 1 after the academic year in which the institution failed to fulfill the requirements.

“20.5.2.3 Failure to Meet Reclassifying Membership Requirements. A reclassifying member failing to meet and maintain the conditions set forth in Bylaw 20.5 may be required to repeat a year of the reclassifying process (with or without conditions), or have its reclassifying membership terminated by a two-thirds vote of the Division II Membership Committee members present and voting. A notice of intention to terminate membership, stating the grounds on which such an action will be based, shall be given in writing to the president or chancellor of the reclassifying member institution.

“20.5.2.3.1 Repeat of the Reclassifying Process. The Division II Membership Committee, by a two-thirds majority present and voting, may require a reclassifying member to repeat any one of the two years of the reclassifying period. An institution may repeat one of the two years only one time during the two-year reclassifying period. Waiver decisions made by the Division II Membership Committee are final.

“20.5.2.4 Authority of Management Council. The Management Council shall hear and act on an institution's appeal of a decision made by the Division II Membership Committee in regard to an institution's standing as a reclassifying member.

“20.5.2.5 Minimum Financial Aid Requirement. For a change in division membership petition to be considered, the institution shall annually provide financial assistance that equals one of the following:

- “(a) A minimum of 50 percent of the maximum allowable equivalencies in a minimum of four separate sports, at least two of which must be women's sports;*
- “(b) A minimum total expenditure of \$250,000 in athletically related financial aid, with at least \$125,000 in women's sports. The athletics aid must be awarded in a minimum of four separate sports, at least two of which must be women's sports;*
- “(c) A minimum of 20 total full-equivalency grants, with at least 10 total full-equivalency grants in women's sports. The grants must be awarded in a minimum of four separate sports, at least two of which must be women's sports.*

“20.5.2.5.1 Continuing Financial Aid Awards to Satisfy Minimum Requirements. In counting financial

aid awarded to student-athletes to determine if the requirements set forth in Bylaw 20.5.2.5 have been satisfied, the institution must satisfy the following:

- “(a) Only countable financial aid awarded, as set forth on the NCAA financial aid squad list form, may be used to meet the appropriate minimum;
- “(b) Countable financial aid awarded to a student-athlete who has exhausted eligibility or awarded to a medically exempt student-athlete may be used to meet the appropriate minimum;
- “(c) To be included in reaching the appropriate minimum, the financial aid actually must be awarded; and
- “(d) Countable aid awarded in emerging sports for women and non-NCAA sports may not be used to meet the appropriate minimum.

“20.5.2.5.1.1 Counting Sports Classified as Division I. For purposes of counting financial aid awarded to student-athletes, an institution may use a sport classified as a Division I sport in order to satisfy the minimum financial aid requirements for Division II membership set forth in Bylaw 20.5.2.5.

“20.5.2.5.2 Single-Gender Programs. Institutions that sponsor and conduct athletics programs for only one gender must award at least one-half of the minimum requirements set forth in Bylaw 20.5.2.5-(a)-(c).

“20.5.2.5.3 Waiver of Minimum Financial Aid Requirement. The Membership Committee, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may waive the minimum financial aid requirement for Division II membership based on objective evidence that demonstrates circumstances that warrant the waiver of the normal application of the legislation.

[20.5.3 through 20.5.3.2 renumbered as 20.5.2 through 20.5.2.2, unchanged.]

“20.5.32.2.1 Three-Year Requirement. The Management Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant waivers of the three-year membership provisions of Bylaw 20.5.32.1 if it deems that unusual circumstances warrant such action.

“20.5.32.2.2 New Division or Subdivision. When the institution’s reclassification was the direct result of the creation of a new division or subdivision, the Executive Committee, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant waivers of the three-year requirement of Bylaw 20.5.32.1 if it deems that unusual circumstances warrant such action.

“20.5.3.2.3 Waiver of Exploratory Year. An institution may appeal to the Membership Committee for a waiver of the exploratory year in the change of division membership process. Such an appeal must be received in the NCAA national office not later than June 1 prior to the academic year that the institution is scheduled to begin its one-year exploratory period. Decisions made by the Membership Committee regarding a waiver of the exploratory year are final.”

[20.5.3.3 through 20.5.3.3.2 renumbered as 20.5.2.3 through 20.5.2.3.2, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007; for those institutions entering the membership process on August 1, 2007 and thereafter.

Rationale: Provisional and reclassifying members ultimately seek the same result; active Division II membership. Given the differences in divisional legislation, it is appropriate that current NCAA institutions seeking a change of division in all sports be treated the same as nonmember institutions who seek NCAA membership within Division II. A uniform membership process that emphasizes systematic manageable growth and clarifies the expectations for Division II active membership increases the likelihood that potential members are prepared for Division II active membership.

***NO. 5 (NO. 2-10) RECRUITING AND AWARDS AND BENEFITS — STRATEGIC POSITIONING AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT INITIATIVES**

Intent: To establish an environment for strategic positioning and community engagement activities, as follows: (1) Define a community engagement activity; (2) Specify that the recruiting regulations do not apply when institutional staff members (including spouses and other family members), representatives of the institution’s athletics interests and student-athletes are engaged in community engagement activities with prospective student-athletes, as specified; (3) Specify that an enrolled student-athlete may have contact with a prospective student-athlete, including off-campus, in-person contact, written or electronically transmitted correspondence and telephone contact, at any time, provided the contact is not at the direction of a coaching staff member or a representative of the institution’s athletics interests; (4) Permit a spouse, other family members (e.g., children) and a significant other of an institutional staff member to have contact with a prospective student-athlete either on or off campus and on an official visit within the locale of the institution; (5) Amend the meeting or banquet legislation for all sports, as specified; (6) Specify that an institution may advertise or promote its community engagement activities in any publication; (7) Permit an institution or conference to do

nate used athletics and nonathletics equipment to high schools, as specified; (8) Permit an institution to provide actual and necessary expenses to student-athletes for participation in community engagement activities; (9) Permit a community organization or entity to provide actual and necessary expenses to student-athletes for participation in community engagement activities; and (10) Permit an institution or an entity within the institution's community to recognize student-athletes for their community engagement achievements, as specified.

- A. **Bylaws:** Amend 13.02 by adding new 13.02.1, pages 73-76, as follows:

[Roll Call]

"13.02 DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS

"13.02.1 Community Engagement Activity. A community engagement activity is an activity in which a member institution participates for the primary purpose of enhancing the community, rather than benefiting the institution. The institution must be able to demonstrate how the engagement of the institution's assets (e.g., its student-athletes, its facilities) is meeting a specific identified community need or show how the use of its aforementioned assets links the institution to an overall school-wide community support strategy. The defining element of a community engagement activity is the clear intent of the member institution to provide value to the community.

"13.02.1.1 Application. A community engagement activity shall not be considered recruiting for purposes of securing a prospective student-athlete's enrollment and ultimate participation in the institution's intercollegiate athletics program. Therefore, the recruiting regulations set forth in Bylaw 13 do not apply when institutional staff members (including spouses and other family members), representatives of the institution's athletics interests and student-athletes are engaged in community engagement activities with prospective student-athletes, except for the following:

"(a) A community engagement activity may not take place during a dead period; and

"(b) A representative of the institution's athletics interest is limited to participating in community engagement activities with prospective student-athletes when all prospective student-athletes reside within a 100-mile radius of the location of the community engagement activity.

"13.02.1.2 Effect of Violation. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, such violations shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's or student-athlete's eligibility."

[13.02.1 through 13.02.12 renumbered as 13.02.2 through 13.02.13, unchanged.]

- B. **Bylaws:** Amend 13.02.4.1, pages 74-75, as follows:

[Roll Call]

"13.02.4.1 Permissible Recruitment Activities for Enrolled Student-Athletes

"(a) Off-campus contacts. Off-campus, in-person recruiting contacts *that are unavoidable incidental contacts* between enrolled student-athletes (or other enrolled students) and a prospective student-athlete are permissible if such contacts do not occur at the direction of a coaching staff member **or a representative of the institution's athletics interests.**

"(b) Telephone contact. It is permissible for an enrolled student-athlete to **make or** receive telephone calls *made at the expense of* **from** a prospective student-athlete *after July 1 after the completion of the prospective student-athlete's junior year in high school at any time, provided such telephone calls do not occur at the direction of a coaching staff member or a representative of the institution's athletics interests. Telephone calls made by enrolled students in accordance with an institution's regular admissions program directed at all prospective students shall be permissible.*

"(c) Written **or electronically transmitted** correspondence. It is permissible for an enrolled student-athlete to engage in written **or electronically transmitted** correspondence **with a prospective student-athlete,** provided it is not done at the direction and/or expense of *the member institution a coaching staff member or a representative of the institution's athletics interests.*

"(d) Interaction during a community engagement activity. It is permissible for an enrolled student-athlete to **engage or interact** (e.g., contact, telephone calls) **with a prospective student-athlete at the direction of a coaching staff member, provided the engagement or interaction is a part of a community engagement activity."**

[13.04.2.1-(d) through 13.04.2.1-(f) renumbered as 13.04.2.1-(e) through 13.04.2.1-(g), unchanged.]

- C. **Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.2.2, pages 77-78, as follows:

[Roll Call]

"13.1.2.2 General Exceptions. This regulation is not applicable to:

[13.1.2.2-(a) through 13.1.2.2-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Spouse, **Other Family Members and Significant Other** of Staff Member

"(1) On **or Off** Campus. A spouse, **other family members (e.g., children) and a significant other** of an institutional staff member on **or off** campus.

"(2) Off Campus during Official Visit. A spouse, **other family**

members (e.g., children) and a significant other of an athletics department staff member during a prospective student-athlete's official visit and within a 30-mile radius the locale of the institution's main campus during the prospective student-athlete's official visit."

[13.1.2.2-(f) through 13.1.2.2-(h) unchanged.]

D. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.9, page 81, as follows:

[Roll Call]

"13.1.9 Banquets and Meetings — All Sports. In all sports, a coach may speak at a meeting or banquet and have contact with prospective student-athletes, provided:

"(a) All Sports Other Than Football or Basketball. In sports other than football and basketball, the coach may speak at a meeting or banquet (except for dead periods per Bylaw 13.02.3.4) at a prospective student-athlete's educational institution without using one of the institution's permissible contacts or evaluations, provided The coach does not make a recruiting presentation in conjunction with the appearance;

"(1) The meeting or banquet is initiated and conducted by the educational institution;

"(2) The coach does not make a recruiting presentation in conjunction with the appearance;

"(3) The coach does not have any direct contact with any prospective student-athlete (or the prospective student-athlete's relatives or legal guardians) in attendance; and

"(4) The coach does not engage in any evaluation activities at the educational institution.

"(b) Football and Basketball The meeting or banquet is initiated and conducted by the educational institution (e.g., high school);

"(1) During a Contact Period. In football and basketball, an institution's coaching staff member who speaks at a meeting or banquet at a prospective student-athlete's educational institution during the contact period, uses an evaluation for each prospective student-athlete in the coach's sport. The coach does not use a contact, provided he or she does not make a recruiting presentation in conjunction with the appearance and has no direct contact with any prospective student-athlete (or the prospective student-athlete's parents) in attendance.

"(2) Outside a Contact Period. A member of the basketball or football coaching staff may speak at a meeting or banquet outside the recruiting contact periods (except for dead periods per Bylaw 13.02.3.4), provided:

"(i) The coach does not make a recruiting presentation in conjunction with the appearance; and

"(ii) The coach does not have direct contact with any prospective student-athlete in attendance.

"(c) The contact is not for the purpose of securing the enrollment or ultimate participation of the prospective student-athlete(s) in the institution's intercollegiate athletics program; and

"(d) The meeting or banquet does not take place during a dead period."

E. Bylaws: Amend 13.4, pages 84-85, as follows:

[Roll Call]

"13.4 RECRUITING MATERIALS

[13.4.1 through 13.4.1.2 unchanged.]

"13.4.2 Video/Audio Materials. An institution may not produce video/audio materials to show or send to a prospective student-athlete except as specified in Bylaw 13.4.2.1, and 13.4.2.2 and 13.4.2.3. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.

[13.4.2.1 and 13.4.2.2 unchanged.]

"13.4.2.3 Community Engagement Activities. An institution may produce, show, send and provide a prospective student-athlete with video/audio materials of its community engagement activities.

[13.4.2.3 renumbered as 13.4.2.4, unchanged.]

[13.4.3 unchanged.]

"13.4.4 Advertisements and Promotions

"13.4.4.1 Recruiting Advertisements. The publication of advertising or promotional material, by or on behalf of a member institution, designed to solicit the enrollment of a prospective student-athlete is not permitted, except as provided in Bylaws 13.4.4.1.1 and 13.4.4.1.2. Accordingly, a member institution may not buy or arrange to have space in game programs or other printed materials published to provide information concerning the athletics participation or evaluation of prospective student-athletes (e.g., recruiting publications) for any purpose whatsoever, including advertisements, a listing of prospective or enrolled student-athletes who will attend the institution and informative materials related to the institution. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.

[13.4.4.1.1 unchanged.]

"13.4.4.1.2 Community Engagement Activities. An institution may advertise or promote its community engagement activities (see Bylaw 13.02.1) in any publication, and provide such advertisements or promotions to a prospective student-athlete at any time."

[13.4.4.1.2 through 13.4.4.1.4 renumbered as 13.4.4.1.3 through 13.4.4.1.5, unchanged.]

[13.4.4.2 through 13.4.4.3 unchanged.]

F. Bylaws: Amend 13.15.1.6, pages 103-104, as follows:

[Roll Call]

“13.15.1.6 Donation of Equipment

“13.15.1.6.1 Athletics Equipment. **An member institution or conference** may not provide **used** athletics equipment to a high school. *However, a member institution is permitted to provide or* athletics equipment to bona fide youth organizations (e.g., the YMCA, YWCA, boy scout troops, girl scout troops, a summer recreational league) that may consist of some prospective student-athletes, provided the issuance of equipment is in accordance with the institution’s **or conference’s** regular policy regarding the discarding of equipment. *Further, only those organizations within a 30-mile radius of the campus may be provided such equipment by the institution.* Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, such violations shall not affect the student-athlete’s eligibility.

“13.15.1.6.1.1 Exception — Women’s Rowing. An institution may loan rowing equipment to a high school’s or junior club program’s women’s team on an issuance and retrieval basis and may permit high schools’ and junior club programs’ women’s teams to use its rowing facilities for practice and/or competition.

“13.15.1.6.1.2 Donation of Used Athletics Equipment to Foundation. An institution may donate used athletics equipment to a nonprofit foundation established to distribute such equipment to high schools, provided the request for such donations is initiated by the foundation and the institutions have no part in selecting the high schools that are to receive the equipment.

“13.15.1.6.2 Nonathletics Equipment. **An member institution or conference** may provide nonathletics equipment (e.g., a computer) to a high school, provided *there is no athletics department involvement and the equipment is not used to benefit only the high school’s athletics program* **the issuance of equipment is in accordance with the institution’s or conference’s regular policy regarding the discarding of equipment.”**

G. Bylaws: Amend 16.9, page 171, as follows:

[Roll Call]

“16.9 PERMISSIBLE TRAVEL EXPENSES NOT RELATED TO PRACTICE OR COMPETITION. It is permissible for an institution to provide the following travel expenses not related to practice or competition:

[16.9-(a) through 16.9-(e) unchanged.]

“(f) Community Engagement Activities. Actual and necessary expenses may be provided to a student-athlete for participation in community engagement activities (see Bylaw 13.02.1).”

H. Bylaws: Amend 16.10.1 by adding new 16.10.1.5, pages 171-172, as follows:

[Roll Call]

“16.10.1 Permissible

[16.10.1.1 through 16.10.1.4 unchanged.]

“16.10.1.5 Community Organization/Entity. A community organization or entity may provide actual and necessary expenses to student-athletes for participation in community engagement activities (see Bylaw 13.02.1).”

I. Bylaws: Amend 16-3, page 177, as follows:

[Roll Call]

Figure 16-3: Special Achievement Awards				
Type of Award	Maximum Value of Award	Number of Times Award May Be Received	Permissible Awarding Agencies	Maximum Number of Permissible Awarding Agencies
Permit an institution or an organization/ entity within the institution’s community to recognize student-athletes for their community engagement achievements.	\$80	Unlimited	Institution Organization/ Entity in the institution’s community	Unlimited

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Management Council [Community Advisory Group]).

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: Following the Division II Chancellors and Presidents Summit in June 2005, the Division II Presidents Council agreed to implement a comprehensive study related to the defining characteristics and key attributes of the division. The ultimate objective of this study was to clarify the division’s strategic position and; thus, provide Division II institutions with an opportunity to celebrate who we are, what we believe in and why we do the things we do. Research data indicates that a priority for Division II should be to increase support in the local community. A component of the Division II strategic position is community engagement. Recruiting and awards and benefits regulations should not prohibit an institution, representatives of an institution’s athletics interests, student-athletes and prospective student-athletes from participating in legitimate, organized and predetermined com-

munity engagement activities. The proposed changes to Bylaws 13 and 16 enhances the ability of institutions, representatives of its athletics interests, student-athletes and prospective student-athletes to get involved with and give back to the community. Therefore, the amendments to some of the recruiting and awards and benefits legislation is necessary to support and promote community engagement. It is advantageous to the entire Division II membership to permit institutions to be involved in the community. It is paramount to eliminate some of the “red tape” legislation that currently prevents the membership from doing so. Finally, it is in the spirit of the Division II environment to allow each member’s own policies and procedures to govern community engagement, where possible.

***NO. 6 (NO. 2-12) RECRUITING — OFFICIAL VISIT REQUIREMENTS AND WRITTEN OFFERS OF ATHLETICALLY RELATED FINANCIAL AID — REGISTRATION WITH INITIAL-ELIGIBILITY CLEARINGHOUSE AND INSTITUTIONAL REQUEST LIST**

Intent: To specify that an institution shall not provide an official visit to a high school or preparatory school prospective student-athlete until he or she registers with the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse and is placed on the institutional request list; further, to specify that an institution shall not provide a high school or preparatory school prospective student-athlete a written offer of athletically related financial aid until the prospective student-athlete has registered with the Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse and the institution places the prospective student-athlete on the institutional request list (IRL) with the Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.6, pages 87-91, as follows:

[Roll Call]

“13.6 OFFICIAL (PAID) VISIT

[13.6.1 through 13.6.1.2.2 unchanged.]

“13.6.1.2.3 **13.6.2 Academic** Requirements for Official Visit. **An institution shall not provide an official visit to a high school or preparatory school prospective student-athlete until he or she:**

“13.6.1.2.3.1 *PSAT, SAT, PLAN OR ACT SCORE.* A member institution may not provide an expense-paid visit to a high school or preparatory school prospect who has not presented the institution with

“(a) **Presents** a score from a PSAT, an SAT, a PLAN or an ACT test taken on a national testing date under national testing conditions, except that a state-administered ACT examination may be used to meet the requirement. The score must be presented through a testing agency document, on a high school (or college) academic transcript (official or unofficial) or through the use of

the applicable testing agency’s automated-voice system. A foreign prospective student-athlete or learning-disabled prospective student-athlete who requires a special administration of the PSAT, SAT, PLAN or ACT may present such a score upon the approval of the appropriate academic requirements committee;

“(b) **Registers with the Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse;** and

“(c) **Is placed on the institution’s institutional request list (IRL) with the Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse.**”

[13.6.1.2.3.2 through 13.6.1.2.3.3 renumbered as 13.6.2.1 through 13.6.2.2, unchanged.]

[13.6.1.3 through 13.6.1.4 renumbered as 13.6.2.3 through 13.6.2.4, unchanged.]

[13.6.2 through 13.6.7.1 renumbered as 13.6.3 through 13.6.8.1, unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.9, page 94, as follows:

[Roll Call]

“13.9 LETTER-OF-INTENT PROGRAMS, FINANCIAL AID AGREEMENTS

“13.9.1 **Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse Registration and Institutional Request List.** An institution shall not provide a high school or preparatory school prospective student-athlete a written offer of athletically related financial aid (per Bylaw 15.3.2.3) until the prospective student-athlete has registered with the Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse and the institution has placed the prospective student-athlete on the institutional request list (IRL) with the Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse.

“13.9.1.2 *General Restrictions* **Institutional or Conference Letter of Intent Programs.** A member institution may participate in an institutional or conference athletics letter-of-intent program or issue an institutional or conference financial aid agreement during the early signing period of the National Letter of Intent (NLI) (in those sports that have an NLI early signing period); however, once the early signing period has elapsed, an institutional or conference letter of intent or financial aid agreement may not be issued prior to the regular or late signing period for the National Letter of Intent program in the same sport.

[13.9.1.1 through 13.9.1.2 renumbered as 13.9.2.1 through 13.9.2.2, unchanged.]

“13.9.1.3 *Effect of Violation.* Violations of Bylaw 13.9.1 and its subsections shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, such violations shall not affect the prospective student-athlete’s eligibility.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (NCAA Working Group to Review Initial-Eligibility Trends)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: High school and preparatory school prospective student-athletes are best served by early notification of their academic status for purposes of NCAA eligibility. There has been a growing trend of late Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse registration by prospective student-athletes and by institutions. This leads to an inability to properly advise prospective student-athletes regarding academic deficiencies. Encouraging early registration by high school and preparatory school prospective student-athletes and institutional request list submission by institutions enhances the integrity of the Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse process and fosters sound academic behaviors. Specifically, this proposal requires a high school or preparatory school prospective student-athlete to have registered with the Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse and the prospective student-athlete to appear on the institution's institutional request list prior to an official visit or a written offer of athletically related financial aid. These requirements will not prevent institutions from conducting normal admission and nonathletic financial aid processes.

***NO. 7 (NO. 2-21) FINANCIAL AID AND EXECUTIVE
REGULATIONS — ELIGIBILITY FOR
CHAMPIONSHIPS — STRUCTURE OF
FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP
CLASSIFICATIONS**

Intent: In football, to establish two championship classifications, based on the total number of financial aid equivalencies provided by an institution; further, to specify that an institution or conference on behalf of its member institutions shall declare once every three years the championship classification in which its member institutions will participate.

A. Bylaws: Amend 15.5.2.1.1, pages 156-157, as follows:

[Roll Call, football only]

“15.5.2.1.1 Men's Sports. There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.4.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in each men's sport (**See Bylaw 31.3.1.1 regarding additional football equivalency limitations for championships.**), as follows:”

B. Administrative: Amend 31.2 by adding new 31.2.1, pages 322-326, as follows:

[Roll Call, football only]

“31.2 Eligibility for Championships

“31.2.1 Institution or Conference Eligibility — Football. To be eligible to enter teams or individual student-athletes in an NCAA Division II football championship (see Bylaw 31.3.1.1), an institution or conference on behalf of its member institutions shall declare the championship classification in which it will participate. The institution or confer-

ence eligibility declaration shall be completed by September 1, and is binding on the institution or conference for a period of three years.

“31.2.1.1 Compliance with Deadline. Any dues payment or approved form(s) shall be received in the national office by the applicable date or must have been postmarked not later than seven days before the applicable date.”

[31.2.1 through 31.2.3 renumbered as 31.2.2 through 31.2.4, unchanged.]

C. Administrative: Amend 31.3.1 by adding new 31.3.1.1, page 326, as follows:

[Roll Call, football only]

“31.3.1 Size of Championships Fields. The size of all NCAA championships fields shall be established by the Championships Committee to provide for efficient management of the events, adequate NCAA championship opportunities relative to the nationwide quality of competition and sound economic administration of the financial resources of the Association and its championships.

“31.3.1.1 Size of Football Championship Classifications. The size of the two football championship classifications are based on the total number of financial aid equivalencies provided annually by an institution. Per Bylaw 31.2.1, an institution or conference on behalf of its member institutions shall declare the championship classification in which it will participate. One football championship classification is open to institutions or conferences' member institutions who provide up to the maximum financial aid equivalency limit or less in Bylaw 15.5.2.1.1. The other football championship classification is open to institutions or conferences' member institutions who provide 50 percent or less than the maximum financial aid equivalency limit in Bylaw 15.5.2.1.1. All other policies and procedures regarding the administration of the two football championship classifications shall be established by the Championships Committee.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Football Task Force) (Developed by the Football Task Force and introduced by the NCAA Division II Management Council to fulfill its obligation to the membership by recommending a proposal to address issues regarding the Division II football championship structure)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2008, for those conferences and institutions participating in the championship segment on or after August 1, 2009.

Rationale: Following the 2005 NCAA Convention, the Division II Football Task Force was created to study a possible change to the Division II football championship structure that would provide more competitive equity. The consensus was that the current maximum financial aid equivalency limit in football should be

protected; however, new opportunities should be considered to give programs that offer significantly fewer scholarships a chance to be competitive in the postseason. This proposal will establish two national championship classifications in Division II football. One championship classification will be established for institutions that provide financial aid from zero to 36 total equivalencies. The other championship classification will be established for institutions that provide 50 percent or less than the maximum financial aid equivalency limit, or zero to 18 total equivalencies. This new Division II football championship model will take effect for the 2009 championship season. In addition, this proposal will also require institutions or conferences on behalf of its member institutions to declare once every three years, its level of playoff competition. This commitment will be binding for three years. The creation of this model will enhance and preserve the competitive equity in Division II football, while improving the student-athlete experience.

***NO. 8 (NO. 2-20) FINANCIAL AID — MAXIMUM EQUIVALENCY LIMITS — DIVISION DOMINANT PROVISIONS**

Intent: To specify that the financial aid maximum equivalency limits legislation and all its subparts are division dominant provisions.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.2.1, pages 156-157, as follows:

[Roll Call]

[To change the voting line in Bylaws 15.5.2.1, 15.5.2.1.1, 15.5.2.1.1.1, 15.5.2.1.2, 15.5.2.1.3 and 15.5.2.1.4 from federated to division dominant.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Football Task Force)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: NCAA Constitution 5.02.1.1.1 provides for division dominant provisions that are sufficiently important to the division to require a two-thirds majority vote of all the delegates present and voting at a division's annual or special Convention. This proposal will specify that modifications to the maximum financial aid equivalency limits in all Division II championship sports would require a two-thirds vote of Division II institutions present and voting at the annual or special Convention. Any changes to the financial aid maximum equivalency limits in Division II championship sports should be supported by a two-thirds majority vote of the membership present and voting due to the potentially large impact on student-athlete well-being issues that could occur if such changes were adopted. In addition, because of the numerous benefits (e.g., access to higher education) financial aid provides a student-athlete, it was agreed that any changes to financial aid equivalencies should have overwhelming support by the Division

II membership and not simply a majority of the membership. By requiring a two-thirds majority vote of the delegates present and voting, the Division II membership is assured of some stability related to financial aid equivalencies.

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY AND PROCESS

***NO. 9 (NO. 2-2) LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY AND PROCESS — AMENDMENT PROCESS — SPECIAL VOTING REQUIREMENTS — FINANCIAL AID EQUIVALENCY REDUCTIONS**

Intent: To specify that an amendment to reduce the financial aid equivalency in any sport requires a two-thirds majority vote of all members present and voting at an annual or special Convention.

Constitution: Amend 5.3.10 by adding new 5.3.10.5, page 42, as follows:

[Roll Call]

"5.3.10 Special Voting Requirements. The following topics are subject to special voting requirements.

[5.3.10.1 through 5.3.10.4 unchanged.]

"5.3.10.5 Voting on Financial Aid Equivalency Reductions. Adoption of an amendment to reduce a financial aid equivalency in any sport shall require a two-thirds majority vote of all members present and voting at an annual or special Convention."

Source: Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and Gulf South Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: Athletically related financial aid is an important element in a student-athlete's pursuit of a college degree. Under current legislation, Division II institutions may provide several student-athletes with athletic financial aid. Therefore, any effort to reduce the number of equivalencies in any sport that may be provided by an institution should require a two-thirds majority vote of all members present and voting to confirm those are the wishes of the membership.

Committee Position (NCAA Division II Presidents Council and Legislation Committee): The Council and committee agreed to take no position on this proposal. (NCAA Division II Management Council): The Council supports the Presidents Council-sponsored proposal that requires a two-thirds majority vote for any reduction or increase in financial aid equivalencies, but agreed to support this proposal if the Presidents Council-sponsored proposal fails. If the Presidents Council-sponsored proposal is adopted, this proposal would be moot.

STUDENT-ATHLETE WELL-BEING GROUPING

NO. 10 (NO. 2-6) AMATEURISM — DRAFT AND INQUIRY — DRAFT EXCEPTION — ALL SPORTS

Intent: To permit an enrolled student-athlete in any sport to enter a professional league's draft an unlimited number of times during his or her collegiate career and be drafted by any team in the league without jeopardizing eligibility in that sport, provided the student-athlete does not hire an agent, sign an agreement with any professional athletics team or otherwise jeopardize his or her amateur status.

Bylaws: Amend 12.2.4, page 63, as follows:

“12.2.4 Draft and Inquiry

[12.2.4.1 through 12.2.4.2 unchanged.]

“12.2.4.2.1 Draft Exception — *Professional Basketball Draft — Four-Year College Student-Athlete — All Sports.* **An enrolled student-athlete in basketball may enter a professional league's draft one an unlimited number of times during his or her collegiate career and be drafted by any team in the league** without jeopardizing eligibility in that sport, provided the student-athlete **does not hire an agent, sign a professional sports contract or otherwise jeopardize his or her amateur status** is not drafted by any team in that league and the student-athlete declares his or her intention to resume intercollegiate participation within 30 days after the draft. The student-athlete's declaration of intent shall be in writing to the institution's director of athletics.

“12.2.4.2.2 Exception — *Professional Basketball Draft — Two-Year College Prospective Student-Athlete.* A prospective student-athlete enrolled at a two-year collegiate institution in basketball may enter a professional league's draft one time during his or her collegiate career without jeopardizing eligibility in that sport, provided the prospective student-athlete is not drafted by any team in that league.

“12.2.4.2.3 Exception — *National Football League (NFL) Draft.* An enrolled student-athlete in football may enter the National Football League (NFL) draft one time during his collegiate career without jeopardizing eligibility in that sport, provided the student-athlete is not drafted by any team in that league and the student-athlete declares his intention to resume intercollegiate participation within 72-hours following the NFL draft declaration date. The student-athlete's declaration of intent shall be in writing to the institution's director of athletics.”

[12.2.4.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: The opportunity for a student-athlete to enter a professional league's draft one time during his or her collegiate career is currently available in football and basketball. Student-athletes in all sports should be afforded this opportunity as professional opportunities continue to grow. Student-athletes in all sports should be permitted to enter a professional league's draft an unlimited number of times during his or her collegiate career and be drafted by any team in the league without jeopardizing eligibility in his or her sport, provided the student-athlete does not violate the amateurism rules. There are numerous benefits to a student-athlete and his or her institution when permitting a student-athlete to enter a professional league's draft an unlimited number of times during collegiate enrollment. Specifically, a student-athlete will have more options available. In addition, a student-athlete and his or her institution will have increased exposure. If a student-athlete is not drafted, he or she could still return to school and resume participation. This proposal is consistent with the Division II philosophy to treat all sports in an equitable manner. Further, the declaration to resume intercollegiate athletics participation is not necessary and will eliminate a bureaucratic measure. This proposal was recommended by the NCAA Student-Athlete Well-Being Task Force. The proposal satisfies the goals of the task force by increasing the well-being of student-athletes.

NO. 11 (NO. 2-8) AMATEURISM — PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES — CONTINUATION OF MODELING AND OTHER NONATHLETICALLY RELATED PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES AFTER ENROLLMENT

Intent: To remove the condition that a student-athlete's involvement in modeling and other nonathletically related promotional activities must be initiated prior to his or her enrollment at a member institution.

Bylaws: Amend 12.5.1.3, page 67, as follows:

“12.5.1.3 *Continuation of Modeling and Other Nonathletically Related Promotional Activities after Enrollment.* If An individual **may** accepts remuneration for or permits the use of his or her name or picture to advertise or promote the sale or use of a commercial product or service *before enrollment in a member institution, continued remuneration for the use of the individual's name or picture (under the same or similar circumstances) after enrollment is permitted* without jeopardizing his or her eligibility to participate in intercollegiate athletics only if all of the following conditions apply:

“(a) The individual’s involvement in this type of activity was initiated before his or her enrollment in a member institution;”

[12.5.1.3-(b) through 12.5.1.3-(e) relettered as 12.5.1.3-(a) through 12.5.1.3-(d), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: In the spirit of student-athlete well-being, all student-athletes should have the opportunity to participate in any modeling or nonathletically related promotional activities without requiring that the involvement in this type of activity be initiated prior to enrollment. This change does not eliminate the other conditions or parameters previously placed on this activity, which protect the possibility of abuse. This proposal was recommended by the NCAA Student-Athlete Well-Being Task Force. The proposal satisfies the goals of the task force by increasing the well-being of student-athletes.

NO. 12 (NO. 2-9) AMATEURISM — PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES — PERMISSIBLE — EDUCATIONAL PRODUCTS RELATED TO SPORT SKILL INSTRUCTION

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to receive actual and necessary expenses for participation in activities involving educational products related to sport skill instruction; further, to specify that a student-athlete shall not miss class time to participate in the activity.

Bylaws: Amend 12.5.1.6, page 67, as follows:

“12.5.1.6 Educational Products Related to Sport Skill Instruction. It is permissible for a student-athlete’s name or picture to appear in books, articles and other publications, films, videotapes, and other types of electronic reproduction related to sport skill demonstration, analysis or instruction, provided:

[12.5.1.6-(a) through 12.5.1.6-(b) unchanged.]

“(c) The student-athlete does not receive, *under any circumstances, any remuneration or expenses* for such participation; **however, the student-athlete may receive actual and necessary expenses related to his or her participation; and**

“(d) The student-athlete does not miss class time to participate in the activity; and”

[12.5.1.6-(d) relettered as 12.5.1.6-(e), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: This proposal is consistent with current legislation permitting a student-athlete to receive expenses for participation in promotional or media activities but prohibiting the acceptance of remuneration. The proposal has an immediate effective date, so student-athletes may begin receiving actual and necessary expenses related to participation in spring 2007, provided the student-athlete does not miss any class time to participate in the activity. In addition, this proposal was recommended by the NCAA Student-Athlete Well-Being Task Force. The proposal satisfies the goals of the task force by increasing the well-being of student-athletes.

***NO. 13 (NO. 2-14) ELIGIBILITY — GENERAL REQUIREMENTS — GRADUATE STUDENT/POSTBACCALAUREATE/ SECOND BACCALAUREATE PARTICIPATION — TRANSFER ELIGIBILITY**

Intent: To permit a student-athlete who is enrolled in a graduate or professional school or is enrolled and seeking a second baccalaureate or equivalent degree, at an institution other than the institution from which he or she previously received a baccalaureate degree, to participate in intercollegiate athletics regardless of any previous transfer, provided the student has eligibility remaining.

Bylaws: Amend 14.1.9, pages 111-112, as follows:

[Roll Call]

“14.1.9 Graduate Student/Postbaccalaureate/**Second Baccalaureate** Participation. A student-athlete who is enrolled in a graduate or professional school of the institution he or she previously attended as an undergraduate (regardless of whether the individual has received a United States baccalaureate degree or its equivalent), a student-athlete who is enrolled and seeking a second baccalaureate or equivalent degree at the same institution, or a student-athlete who has graduated and is continuing as a full-time student at the same institution while taking course work that would lead to the equivalent of another major or degree as defined and documented by the institution, may participate in intercollegiate athletics, provided the student has eligibility remaining and such participation occurs within the applicable 10-semester/15-quarter period set forth in Bylaw 14.2 (see also Bylaw 14.1.8.1.7.4).

“14.1.9.1 *One-Time* Transfer Exception. A *graduate* student who *is enrolled transfers and enrolls* in a graduate program, or professional school or **second baccalaureate or equivalent degree program of at** an institution other than the institution he or she previously attended as an undergraduate may participate in intercollegiate athletics, *if the student fulfills the conditions of the one-time transfer exception set forth in Bylaw 14.5.5.3.10 and has eligibility remain-*

ing per Bylaw 14.2 provided the student has eligibility remaining.”

[14.1.9.2 through 14.1.9.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: This proposal permits a student-athlete to participate in intercollegiate athletics while pursuing a graduate, postbaccalaureate or a second undergraduate or equivalent degree at another institution from which he or she previously received a baccalaureate degree, provided the student-athlete has eligibility remaining. Further, a student-athlete under these circumstances would not be required to satisfy the one-time transfer exception in order to use this exception. This is in the best interest of the student-athlete as it promotes opportunities for seeking advanced degrees and allows the student-athlete to reap the full benefit of using all of his or her seasons of competition. This proposal was recommended by the NCAA Student-Athlete Well-Being Task Force. The proposal satisfies the goals of the task force by increasing the well-being of student-athletes.

ETHICAL CONDUCT

NO. 14 (NO. 2-3) ETHICAL CONDUCT — SPORTS WAGERING ACTIVITIES

Intent: To specify and clarify prohibited sports wagering activities and the individuals to whom the prohibitions apply.

A. Bylaws: Amend 10.3 and 10.4, pages 53-54, as follows:

[To change the voting lines in Bylaws 10.3 and 10.4 from federated to common and to designate Bylaw 10.02 as common.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 10, pages 53-54, as follows:

“10 Ethical Conduct

“10.01 GENERAL PRINCIPLES

[10.01.1 unchanged.]

“10.02 DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS

“10.02.1 Sports Wagering. Sports wagering includes placing, accepting or soliciting a wager (on a staff member’s or student-athlete’s own behalf or on behalf of others) of any type with any individual or organization on any intercollegiate, amateur or professional team or contest. Examples of sports wagering include, but are not limited to, the use of a bookmaker or parlay card; Internet sports wagering; auctions in which bids are placed on teams, individuals or contests; and pools or fantasy leagues in which an entry fee is re-

quired and there is an opportunity to win a prize.

“10.02.2 Wager. A wager is any agreement in which an individual or entity agrees to give up an item of value (e.g., cash, shirt, dinner) in exchange for the possibility of gaining another item of value.

[10.1 through 10.2 unchanged.]

“10.3 GAMBLING ACTIVITIES. Staff members of a member conference, staff members of the athletics department of a member institution and student-athletes shall not knowingly:

“(a) Provide information to individuals involved in organized gambling activities concerning intercollegiate athletics competition;

“(b) Solicit a bet on any intercollegiate team;

“(c) Accept a bet on any team representing the institution;

“(d) Solicit or accept a bet on any intercollegiate competition for any item (e.g., cash, shirt, dinner) that has tangible value; or

“(e) Participate in any gambling activity that involves intercollegiate athletics or professional athletics, through a bookmaker, a parlay card or any other method employed by organized gambling.

“10.3 SPORTS WAGERING ACTIVITIES. The following individuals shall not knowingly participate in sports wagering activities or provide information to individuals involved in or associated with any type of sports wagering activities concerning intercollegiate, amateur or professional athletics competition:

“(a) Staff members of an institution’s athletics department;

“(b) Nonathletics department staff members who have responsibilities within or over the athletics department (e.g., chancellor or president, faculty athletics representative, individual to whom athletics reports);

“(c) Staff members of a conference office; and

“(d) Student-athletes.

“10.3.1 Scope of Application. The prohibition against sports wagering applies to any sport or institutional practice or competition (intercollegiate, amateur or professional) in a sport in which the Association conducts championship competition, in bowl subdivision football and in emerging sports for women.

“10.3.1.1 Exception. The provisions of Bylaw 10.3 are not applicable to traditional wagers between institutions (e.g., traditional rivalry) or in conjunction with particular contests (e.g., bowl games). Items wagered must be representative of the involved institutions or the states in which they are located.

“10.3.12 Sanctions. The following sanctions for violations of

Bylaw 10.3 shall apply *as follows*:

“(a) A student-athlete who engages in activities designed to influence the outcome of an intercollegiate contest or in an effort to affect win-loss margins (i.e., “point shaving”) or who solicits or accepts a bet or participates in any *gambling activity through a bookmaker, a parlay card or any other method employed by organized gambling that involves sports* wagering on **activity involving** the student-athlete’s institution shall permanently lose all remaining regular-season and postseason eligibility in all sports.

“(b) A student-athlete who *solicits or accepts a bet or participation* **participates** in any *gambling sports wagering activity that involves intercollegiate athletics or professional athletics*, through **the Internet**, a bookmaker, **or** a parlay card *or any other method employed by organized gambling*, shall be ineligible for all regular-season and postseason competition for a minimum of a period of one year from the date of the institution’s determination that a violation has occurred and shall be charged with the loss of a minimum of one season of **competition eligibility**. If the student-athlete is determined to have been involved in a subsequent violation of any portion of Bylaw 10.3, the student-athlete shall permanently lose all remaining regular-season and postseason eligibility in all sports.

“10.4 DISCIPLINARY ACTION. Prospective or enrolled student-athletes found in violation of the provisions of this regulation shall be ineligible for further intercollegiate competition, subject to appeal to the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement for restoration of eligibility (see Bylaw 10.3.12 for sanctions of student-athletes involved in violations of Bylaw 10.3). Institutional staff members found in violation of the provisions of this regulation shall be subject to disciplinary or corrective action as set forth in Bylaw 19.5.2.2 of the NCAA enforcement procedures, whether such violations occurred at the certifying institution or during the individual’s previous employment at another member institution.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: The legislation regarding sports wagering activities must specifically define the individuals who are covered and the activities that are expressly prohibited. Given the serious consequences (e.g., ineligibility, loss of employment) for violating this bylaw, it is imperative that it be clearly worded and easily understood by the membership. Adding individuals who are involved in intercollegiate athletics, such as the faculty athletics representative and the president or chancellor to the list of per-

sons precluded from participation in sports wagering activities establishes that the rule is uniform in its application. It is important to note that, as a human resources policy, the NCAA national office staff is covered by this prohibition on sports wagering activities. The staff is not mentioned in the proposal because NCAA bylaws are only applicable to member institutions and conferences. Student-athletes, coaches, administrators, faculty athletics representatives and presidents or chancellors and/or the individual with oversight of athletics all are unequivocally subject to the rule.

PERSONNEL

NO. 15 (NO. 2-4) PERSONNEL — CONDUCT AND ATHLETICS PERSONNEL — SPORTS SAFETY TRAINING

Intent: To specify that all coaches present at each practice, competition, skill instruction and strength and conditioning session involving student-athletes shall be certified in first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and automatic external defibrillator (AED) use and shall be familiar with emergency plan activation policies.

A. Bylaws: Amend 11.1 by adding new 11.1.6, page 55, as follows:

“11.1 CONDUCT OF ATHLETICS PERSONNEL

[11.1.1 through 11.1.5 unchanged.]

“11.1.6 **Sports Safety Training.** All coaches present at each practice, competition, skill instruction and strength and conditioning session involving student-athletes shall be certified in first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and automatic external defibrillator (AED) use and shall be familiar with emergency plan activation policies.”

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.1 by adding new 17.1.10, pages 182-188, as follows:

[17.1.1 through 17.1.9 unchanged.]

“17.1.10 **Sports Safety Presence.** All coaches present at each practice, competition, skill instruction and strength and conditioning sessions involving student-athletes shall be certified in first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and automatic external defibrillator (AED) use and be familiar with emergency plan activation policies.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: A survey of the NCAA death claims since 1992 reports 60

percent of all nonvehicle related deaths have been due to heart-related conditions and 83 percent of all deaths occurred during practice or conditioning. The goal of this proposal is to ensure that someone certified in first aid and CPR is present at practice, competition, skill instruction and strength and conditioning sessions to care for all participating student-athletes. The training should be consistent with certification from a nationally recognized organization in first aid, CPR and AED. Additionally, Division II grant and initiative funding may be used to certify all coaches in first aid and CPR or to purchase an AED.

AMATEURISM

*NO. 16 (NO. 2-5) AMATEURISM — INVOLVEMENT WITH PROFESSIONAL TEAMS — TRYOUT AFTER ENROLLMENT

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to try out with a professional team at anytime outside the student-athlete's playing and practice season and to receive actual and necessary expenses from a professional sports organization, provided the tryout does not exceed 48 hours.

Bylaws: Amend 12.2.1, page 62, as follows:
[Roll Call]

"12.2.1 Tryouts

"12.2.1.1 Tryout after Enrollment. A student-athlete *shall not may* try out with a professional athletics team in a sport or permit a professional athletics team to conduct medical examinations *during any part of the academic year (i.e., from the beginning of the fall term through the completion of the spring term, including any intervening-vacation period)* while enrolled in a collegiate institution as a regular student in at least a minimum full-time academic load, unless the student-athlete has exhausted eligibility in that sport. The student-athlete may try out with a professional organization in a sport during the summer or during the academic year while not a full-time student-provided the student-athlete does not receive any form of expenses or other compensation from the professional organization. **at anytime outside the student-athlete's playing and practice season. A student-athlete may receive actual and necessary expenses related to the tryout from a professional sports organization, provided the tryout does not exceed 48 hours.**

"12.2.1.1.1 Medical-Examination Exception. A single scouting bureau recognized by a professional league is permitted to conduct one medical examination per student-athlete during the academic year, without jeopardizing the student-athlete's eligibility in that sport, provided the examination does not occur off campus."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: This proposal expands the professional tryout opportunities available to student-athletes. This proposal will permit a student-athlete to have the benefit of a tryout during a larger portion of the academic year and will allow a student-athlete to receive actual and necessary expenses related to the tryout from a professional sports organization. This proposal will bring greater consistency to permissible tryout expenses regardless of whether the tryout occurs before or after the individual's initial full-time collegiate enrollment.

NO. 17 (NO. 2-7) AMATEURISM — INVOLVEMENT WITH PROFESSIONAL TEAMS — DRAFT AND INQUIRY — EXCEPTION — INTERNATIONAL BASKETBALL DRAFT

Intent: In basketball, to permit a student-athlete in his or her final year of eligibility to enter and be drafted during the basketball season by an international organization without forfeiting his or her eligibility in basketball.

Bylaws: Amend 12.2.4.2.1, page 63, as follows:

"12.2.4.2.1 Exception - Professional Basketball Draft - Four-Year College Student-Athlete. A student-athlete in basketball may enter a professional league's draft one time during his or her collegiate career without jeopardizing eligibility in that sport, provided the student-athlete is not drafted by any team in that league and the student-athlete declares his or her intention to resume inter-collegiate participation within 30 days after the draft. The student-athlete's declaration of intent shall be in writing to the institution's director of athletics. **However, a student-athlete in basketball may enter an international basketball draft and may be drafted during his or her final year of eligibility without jeopardizing eligibility in basketball.**"

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: Given the timing of international basketball drafts (during the collegiate basketball season), enrolled student-athletes are unnecessarily precluded from participating in international basketball drafts during their final year of eligibility. Allowing this limited exception would not compromise the intent of the amateurism principles. Existing legislation regarding agents and benefits would still apply, and preclude involvement with agents and the professional team beyond being drafted.

RECRUITING

NO. 18 (NO. 2-11) RECRUITING, ELIGIBILITY AND FINANCIAL AID — HEARING OPPORTUNITY — POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Intent: To specify that notification of the institution's decision to deny a student-athlete's request to permit another institution to contact the student-athlete about transferring, notification of the institution's decision to deny the student-athlete's request for release as a condition of the one-time transfer exception and notification to a student-athlete regarding the reduction or cancellation of aid during the period of the award or the reduction or nonrenewal of aid for the following academic year must include a copy of the institution's established policies and procedures for conducting the required hearing, including the deadline by which a student-athlete must request such a hearing; further, to specify that the institution shall conduct the hearing within 30 consecutive calendar days of receiving a student-athlete's request.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.1.2.1, page 76, as follows:

"13.1.1.2.1 Hearing Opportunity. If the institution decides to deny a student-athlete's request to permit any other institution to contact the student-athlete about transferring, the institution shall inform the student-athlete in writing that he or she, on request, shall be provided a hearing conducted by an institutional entity or committee outside of the athletics department (e.g., the office of student affairs; office of the dean of students; or a committee composed of the faculty athletics representative, student-athletes and nonathletics faculty/staff members). *The institution shall have established reasonable procedures for promptly hearing such a request.* **The notification of the hearing opportunity shall include a copy of the institution's policies and procedures for conducting the required hearing, including the deadline by which a student-athlete must request such a hearing. The institution shall conduct the hearing within 30 consecutive calendar days of receiving a student-athlete's request for the hearing.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.5.5.3.10, pages 133-134, as follows:

"14.5.5.3.10 One-Time Transfer Exception. The student transfers to the certifying institution from another four-year collegiate institution, and all of the following conditions are met (for graduate students, see Bylaw 14.1.9.1):

[14.5.5.3.10-(a) through 14.5.5.3.10-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) The student's previous institution certifies in writing that it has no objection to the student being granted an exception to the transfer residence requirement. If the student's previous institution denies his or her request for the release, the insti-

tution shall inform the student-athlete in writing that he or she, on request, shall be provided a hearing conducted by an institutional entity or committee outside of the athletics department (e.g., the office of student affairs; office of the dean of students; or a committee composed of the faculty athletics representative, student-athletes and nonathletics faculty/staff members). *The institution shall have established reasonable procedures for promptly hearing such a request.* **The notification of the hearing opportunity shall include a copy of the institution's policies and procedures for conducting the required hearing, including the deadline by which a student-athlete must request such a hearing. The institution shall conduct the hearing within 30 consecutive calendar days of receiving a student-athlete's request for the hearing.**"

[14.5.5.3.10-(e) unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 15.3.2.4, page 154, as follows:

"15.3.2.4 Hearing Opportunity. The institution's regular financial aid authority shall notify the student-athlete in writing of the opportunity for a hearing when institutional financial aid based in any degree on athletics ability is reduced or canceled during the period of the award, or not renewed. **The notification of the hearing opportunity shall include a copy of the institution's established policies and procedures for conducting the required hearing, including the deadline by which a student-athlete must request the hearing.** The institution shall *have established reasonable procedures for promptly hearing such a request* **conduct the hearing within 30 consecutive calendar days of receiving a student-athlete's request for the hearing** and shall not delegate the responsibility for conducting the hearing to the university's athletics department or its faculty athletics committee."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: A specific time frame for permission to contact hearings, one-time transfer-exception release hearings and financial aid hearings benefit the student-athlete and the institution since the issue can be resolved in a reasonable amount of time. This deadline expedites the permission-to-contact, one-time transfer-exception release and financial aid hearings and clarifies what constitutes a "prompt" hearing. Further, the requirement that notification includes policies and procedures regarding the hearing ensures all parties are well informed of the process prior to the hearing. Student-athletes benefit from having access to important procedural information in a timely manner and institutions benefit from reducing confusion and disputes regarding procedures.

ELIGIBILITY

NO. 19 (NO. 2-13) ELIGIBILITY AND PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS — INTERCOLLEGIATE COMPETITION — EXEMPTIONS — FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFER STUDENTS — CLUB TEAM PARTICIPATION

Intent: To specify that a four-year college transfer student who participates on the previous four-year institution's club team prior to transfer shall not be charged with a season of intercollegiate competition.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.02.6 by adding new 14.02.6.3, page 106, as follows:

"14.02.6 Intercollegiate Competition. Intercollegiate competition occurs when a student-athlete in either a two-year or a four-year collegiate institution:

[14.02.6-(a) through 14.02.6-(c) unchanged.]

[14.02.6.1 through 14.02.6.2 unchanged.]

"14.02.6.3 Exemption — Four-Year College Transfer Students — Club Team Participation. Participation by a four-year college transfer student on a club team at the previous four-year institution prior to transfer shall be exempted from the application of this legislation."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.02.8 by adding new 17.02.8.2, page 180, as follows:

"17.02.8 Intercollegiate Competition. Intercollegiate competition occurs when a student-athlete in either a two-year or a four-year collegiate institution:

[17.02.8-(a) through 17.02.8-(c) unchanged.]

[17.02.8.1 unchanged.]

"17.02.8.2 Exemption — Four-Year College Transfer Students — Club Team Participation. Participation by a four-year college transfer student on a club team at a previous four-year institution prior to transfer shall be exempted from the application of this legislation."

Source: California Collegiate Athletic Association and Great Northwest Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: Club team participation is not the equivalent of varsity intercollegiate competition and should not be treated as such. Currently, per an official interpretation, a student-athlete is

charged with a season of competition for participating on a member institution's club team if the institution sponsors the same sport on the varsity level. Further, a student-athlete is not charged with a season of competition for participating on an institution's club team, provided the institution does not sponsor the sport on the varsity intercollegiate level. This change would be applicable only to four-year college transfer students. Therefore, four-year college coaches could not hide student-athletes on club teams, nor could they use club team members to replace ineligible players on its varsity intercollegiate athletics squad. Further, if students are participating on a club team, they would still use time within their 10-semester/15-quarter clock. In addition, it is difficult for institutions to verify the club team participation of a four-year college transfer student at the previous four-year institution since these records are not often maintained. Institutions are frequently left relying on a student's verification, which leaves the possibility of falsification or institutional interpretation differences. This proposal would eliminate the tracking requirement.

Committee Position (NCAA Division II Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee): The Councils and committee oppose this proposal. The Councils and committee noted this proposal treats four-year college transfer students who participate on club teams differently than two-year college transfer students who participate on club teams and student-athletes that chose to remain at the same member institution for their entire academic career. The Councils and committee further noted that four-year college student-athletes who participate on club teams may be encouraged to transfer to member institutions so they can maintain seasons of competition.

NO. 20 (NO. 2-17) ELIGIBILITY — TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS — QUALIFIERS WITH NO PREVIOUS ATTENDANCE AT A FOUR-YEAR COLLEGIATE INSTITUTION

Intent: To permit a two-year college transfer student, who was a qualifier and who has not previously attended a four-year collegiate institution, to be eligible for competition, practice and athletics aid at a Division II institution during the first academic year in residence, provided the student-athlete spent one full-time semester or quarter at the two-year college, presented a minimum grade-point average of 2.000 and satisfactorily completed an average of 12-semester or quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution for each full-time academic term of attendance at the two-year college.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.4, pages 129-131, as follows:

[14.5.4 unchanged.]

“14.5.4.1 Eligibility for Competition, Practice and Athletics Aid — **Qualifier With No Previous Attendance at a Four-Year Collegiate Institution.** A transfer student from a two-year college, **who was a qualifier (per Bylaw 14.3.1.1) and who has not previously attended a four-year collegiate institution,** is eligible for competition, practice and athletics aid during the first academic year in residence at the certifying institution, provided:

“(a) **The student has spent at least one full-time semester or one full-time quarter in residence at the two-year college (excluding summer sessions);**

“(b) **The student has satisfactorily completed an average of at least 12-semester or quarter hours of transferable credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution for each full-time academic term of attendance at the two-year college; and**

“(c) **The student has presented a cumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (see Bylaw 14.5.4.3.2).**

“14.5.4.12 Eligibility for Competition, Practice and Athletics Aid — **All Other Qualifiers, Partial Qualifiers and Nonqualifiers.** A transfer student from a two-year college is eligible for competition, practice and athletics aid during the first academic year in residence at the certifying institution, provided:”

[14.5.4.1-(a) through 14.5.4.1-(b) renumbered as 14.5.4.2-(a) through 14.5.4.2-(b), unchanged.]

[14.5.4.1.1 through 14.5.4.1.3 renumbered as 14.5.4.2.1 through 14.5.4.2.3, unchanged.]

[14.5.4.2 through 14.5.4.4 renumbered as 14.5.4.3 through 14.5.4.5, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Academic Requirements Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: Based on current legislation, it was noted that a student-athlete who was a qualifier, who has not previously attended a four-year collegiate institution and who wants to transfer from a two-year college to a Division II institution has three options after the completion of one full-time semester or quarter of two-year college attendance. The student-athlete may transfer to a Division II institution and serve an academic year of residence, continue to be enrolled as a full-time student at the two-year college for the remainder of a full academic year and then transfer to a Division II institution, or transfer to a Division I institution where he or she could have an opportunity to meet the current Division I two-year college transfer rule for qualifiers. This pro-

posal would provide these specific student-athletes with more flexibility in their transfer decision process while accounting for their academic status prior to and during full-time collegiate enrollment. Also, it should be noted that a student-athlete who was certified as a qualifier could have been immediately eligible for competition, practice and athletics aid at a Division II institution immediately upon graduation from high school. In this situation, it is beneficial to permit two-year college transfer students, who were qualifiers and who never attended a four-year college, to enter a Division II institution after one full-time semester or quarter to improve their opportunity for academic success at the Division II institution. This proposal is consistent with the less bureaucratic, student-athlete well-being philosophy. The proposal does not change the bylaw related to competition in the year of transfer.

NO. 21 (NO. 2-18) ELIGIBILITY — TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS — CREDIT EARNED AT FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTION — PRIOR APPROVAL

Intent: To permit an institution to certify the eligibility of a two-year college transfer student who attended a two-year collegiate institution and, before regular enrollment at the certifying institution, earned credits at a four-year collegiate institution as a part-time student, by using such credits to meet the credit hour requirement of the two-year college transfer rule, as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.4.3.2, page 130, as follows:

“14.5.4.3.2 Credit Earned at Four-Year Institution. If a student-athlete attends a two-year college and, before regular enrollment at a *member the certifying* institution, attains additional credits as a part-time student in a four-year collegiate institution, the hours accumulated at the four-year institution may be used by the *member certifying* institution in determining the student-athlete’s eligibility under the **credit hour requirement of the** two-year college transfer provisions, provided:

“(a) These hours are accepted by the two-year college and are placed on the transcript or other official document by the two-year college from which the student-athlete transfers before the date of initial regular enrollment at the *NCAA member certifying* institution; and

“(b) Any official document (other than the student’s transcript) used by the two-year college for this purpose includes the official seal of the two-year college, is signed by the appropriate academic official of the two-year college and is forwarded directly from the two-year college to the appropriate admissions official of the certifying institution; **or**

“(c) Prior approval by the appropriate academic official of the two-year college was obtained by the student, granting permission to satisfactorily complete hours as a part-time student at a four-year collegiate institution before the date of initial regular enrollment at the certifying institution. Acceptance of approved hours must be in accordance with the transfer policies and procedures of both the two-year college and the certifying institution.”

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Academic Requirements Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: There are issues that arise when a two-year college transfer student, who attended a two-year college and, before regular enrollment at a Division II institution attends a four-year college as a part-time student and earns credits to meet the two-year college transfer rule. Currently, the two-year college transfer students in this situation must transfer credits earned at the four-year college back to the two-year college and have such credits placed on an official transcript or other official document that verifies such credits were accepted at the two-year college, before using the credits to satisfy the two-year college transfer rule. The committee believes that the option of prior approval should be added to the legislation. This change will provide flexibility to two-year college transfer students and two-year colleges. In addition, some two-year colleges have been reluctant to place four-year college credits earned by a two-year college transfer student on the two-year college's transcript. Also, even if a two-year college places the credits on an official transcript, it takes additional time, which may cause the student-athlete to miss practice and/or competition at the certifying institution. This change is consistent with deregulation and benefits the well-being of student-athletes, while maintaining the spirit of the two-year college transfer rule. Two-year college transfer students who will graduate from a two-year college will still be required to have such credits placed on an official transcript or other official document that verifies such credits were accepted at the two-year college.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

*NO. 22 (NO. 2-22) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — PLAYING SEASON REGULATIONS — WEEKLY HOUR LIMITATIONS — OUTSIDE OF PLAYING SEASON — INDIVIDUAL OR TEAM SKILL INSTRUCTION — SPORTS OTHER THAN FOOTBALL

Intent: To specify that all countable athletically related activities outside the playing season are prohibited one week prior to the beginning of the final examination period through the conclusion of each student-athlete's final examinations; further, in sports other than football, to specify that there are no limitations on the number of student-athletes from the same team who may be involved in individual or team skill-related instruction with their coaches.

Bylaws: Amend 17.1.5.2, page 183, as follows:

[Roll Call]

“17.1.5.2 Weekly Hour Limitations — Outside of Playing Season. Outside of the playing season during the academic year, only a student-athlete's participation in weight-training, conditioning, individual **or team** skill instruction and, in football, review of game film shall be permitted. A student-athlete's participation in such activities shall be limited to a maximum of eight hours per week, of which not more than two hours per week may be spent on individual **or team** skill *workouts* **instruction** set forth in Bylaw 17.1.5.2.1 and, in football, review of game film. **All countable athletically related activities outside the playing season are prohibited one week prior to the beginning of the institution's final examination period through the conclusion of each student-athlete's final examinations.** A student-athlete may not participate in any countable athletically related activities outside the playing season during any institutional vacation period (e.g., summer, academic year).

“17.1.5.2.1 **Individual or Team Skill Instruction.** In sports other than football, participation by student-athletes in individual **or team** skill-related instruction is permitted outside the institution's declared playing season, *provided no more than four student-athletes from the same team are involved in skill-related instruction with their coach(es) at any one time in any facility.* **There are no limitations on the number of student-athletes from the same team who may be involved in individual or team skill-related instruction with their coaches.**”

Source: Sunshine State Conference and Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association.

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: This proposal gives coaches the flexibility to include more than four student-athletes in individual skill instruction in response to concerns about the ineffectiveness of limiting the number of student-athletes who are able to participate at any one time. This flexibility will enable student-athletes to use their limited time more efficiently. Currently, student-athletes lose countless hours waiting to get skill instruction when they could be using that time to study. In addition, NCAA Division II institutions have limited athletics facilities and a limited number of coaches, who often also have responsibilities outside of their coaching duties. This rule would help those individuals to use their time more effectively. Further, this would be restricted to no more than two hours per week and the prohibition against activities during the week before and during final exams will ensure that time is available to study.

Committee Position (NCAA Division II Presidents Council, Management Council and Legislation Committee): The Councils and committee opposed this proposal. The Councils and committee noted this proposal is not ripe for review. The Councils and committee further noted that the Division II governance structure is evaluating the individual skill instruction legislation and plans to bring forth a legislative proposal at the 2008 NCAA Convention.

NO. 23 (NO. 2-23) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — PRESEASON PRACTICE — MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS

Intent: To require prospective student-athletes and student-athletes to undergo a medical examination administered or supervised by a physician prior to initial participation in any practice, competition or out-of-season conditioning activities; further, to require an updated medical history each subsequent year.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.1 by adding new 17.1.5, pages 182-188, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

[17.1.1 through 17.1.4 unchanged.]

“17.1.5 Mandatory Medical Examination. Prior to participation in any practice, competition or out-of-season conditioning activities (or, in Division I, permissible voluntary summer conditioning in basketball and football or voluntary individual workouts pursuant to the safety exception), student-athletes who are beginning their initial season of eligibility shall be required to undergo a medical examination or evaluation administered or supervised by a physician (e.g., family physician, team physician). The examination or evaluation must be administered within six months prior to participation in any practice, competition or out-of-season conditioning activities. In following

years, an updated history of the student-athlete’s medical condition shall be administered by an institutional medical staff member (e.g., sports medicine staff, team physician) to determine if additional examinations (e.g., physical, cardiovascular, neurological) are required. The updated history must be administered within six months prior to the student-athlete’s participation in any practice, competition or out-of-season conditioning activities for the applicable academic year.”

[17.1.5 through 17.1.9 renumbered as 17.1.6 through 17.1.10, unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.11.2, pages 208-209, as follows:

“17.11.2 Preseason Practice

[17.11.2.1 unchanged.]

“17.11.2.2 Activities Prior to First Practice Date. Prior to participation in any preseason activities, all prospects and student-athletes shall be required to undergo a medical examination or evaluation administered or supervised by a physician.”

[17.11.2.3 through 17.11.2.4 renumbered as 17.11.2.2 through 17.11.2.3, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: Before student-athletes and prospective student-athletes accept the rigors of organized sport, their health should be evaluated by qualified medical personnel. All participants have a medical examination upon initial entrance to the sport at the intercollegiate level. During subsequent years, an interim history should be administered to determine if additional examinations are required. Currently, there is an inconsistency as to when student-athletes receive physicals and variability in the type of exams. This requirement is currently in place for football and the committee recommends all student-athletes have a pre-participation examination consistent with the legislation for the sport of football under NCAA Bylaw 17.11.2.2 (activities prior to first practice date). Due to the inconsistency in medical forms used nationwide, the committee highly recommends the forms within the “Preparticipation Physical Examination” monograph as a minimal standard since the publication has been endorsed by the American Academy of Family Physicians, American Academy of Pediatrics, American College of Sports Medicine, American Medical Society for Sports Medicine and American Osteopathic Academy of Sports Medicine. Each institution should provide its own preparticipation examination form based on these minimal standards, which includes a thorough history, physical examination and screening for cardiovascular conditions.

Pad #	Institution/Conference	Proposal 4	Proposal 5	Proposal 6	Proposal 7	Proposal 8	Proposal 13	Proposal 15	Proposal 16
1	Abilene Christian University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
2	Adams State College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
3	Adelphi University	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N
4	Albany State University (Georgia)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
5	Alderson-Broadus College								
6	American International College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
7	Anderson University (South Carolina)								
8	Angelo State University	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
9	Arkansas Tech University	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
10	Armstrong Atlantic State University	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y
11	Ashland University	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
12	Assumption College		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
13	Augusta State University	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y
14	Augustana College (South Dakota)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
15	Barry University	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N
16	Barton College	Y	Y	N		N	Y	N	N
17	Bellarmino University	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y
18	Belmont Abbey College								
19	Bemidji State University	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y
20	Benedict College								
21	Bentley College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
22	Bloomfield College	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N
23	Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
24	Bluefield State College	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	N
25	Bowie State University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
26	Brigham Young University - Hawaii								
27	Bryant University	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N
28	C.W. Post Campus/Long Island University	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	Y	N
29	Caldwell College	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	N
30	California Collegiate Athletic Association	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	Y
31	California State Polytechnic University - Pomona	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y
32	California State University - Chico	Y	Y	N		N	Y	N	Y
33	California State University - Dominguez Hills	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N
34	California State University - Los Angeles	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	Y
35	California State University - San Bernardino	Y	Y	N		N	Y	N	Y
36	California State University - Stanislaus	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	N	Y
37	California University of Pennsylvania	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
38	Cameron University	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
39	Carolinas-Virginia Athletics Conference	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	N
40	Carson-Newman College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
41	Catawba College	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
42	Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	Y
43	Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
44	Central Washington University	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
45	Chadron State College	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
46	Chaminade University	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	Y
47	Cheyney University of Pennsylvania	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
48	Christian Brothers University	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N
49	Clarion University of Pennsylvania	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
50	Clark Atlanta University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
51	Clayton State University	Y	Y	N		N	Y	N	Y
52	Coker College	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	N
53	College of Saint Rose	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y
54	Colorado Christian University	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	Y
55	Colorado School of Mines	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
56	Colorado State University-Pueblo	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	Y
57	Columbia Union College								
58	Columbus State University	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
59	Concord University	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
60	Concordia College (New York)								
61	Concordia University - St. Paul	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
62	Converse College								
63	Dallas Baptist University	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	Y
64	Davis and Elkins College	Y	N	Y		N	Y	N	Y
65	Delta State University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
66	Dominican College (New York)	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	N
67	Dowling College	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N
68	Drury University	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	N
69	East Central University	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
70	East Coast Conference	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
71	East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
72	Eastern New Mexico University	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	A
73	Eckerd College	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	N

Pad #	Institution/Conference	Proposal 4	Proposal 5	Proposal 6	Proposal 7	Proposal 8	Proposal 13	Proposal 15	Proposal 16
74	Edinboro University of Pennsylvania	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
75	Elizabeth City State University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		Y	Y
76	Emporia State University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
77	Erskine College								
78	Fairmont State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
79	Fayetteville State University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
80	Felician College	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N
81	Ferris State University	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
82	Florida Gulf Coast University	A	A	Y					
83	Florida Institute of Technology	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y
84	Florida Southern College	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	N
85	Fort Hays State University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
86	Fort Lewis College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
87	Fort Valley State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
88	Francis Marion University	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N
89	Franklin Pierce College	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	N	Y
90	Gannon University	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
91	Georgia College & State University	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	N
92	Georgian Court University	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N
93	Glenville State College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
94	Goldey-Beacom College	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N
95	Grand Canyon University								
96	Grand Valley State University	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
97	Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
98	Great Lakes Valley Conference	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	Y
99	Great Northwest Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N
100	Gulf South Conference	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	A	N
101	Harding University	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	A
102	Hawaii Pacific University								
103	Heartland Conference	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
104	Henderson State University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
105	Hillsdale College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
106	Holy Family University	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N
107	Humboldt State University	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
108	Indiana University of Pennsylvania	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
109	Johnson C. Smith University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
110	Kentucky State University	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
111	Kentucky Wesleyan College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
112	Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
113	Lake Superior State University	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	N	Y
114	Lander University	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
115	Lane College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
116	Le Moyne College	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
117	Lees-McRae College	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N
118	LeMoyne-Owen College								
119	Lenoir-Rhyne College	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
120	Lewis University	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	N	Y
121	Limestone College								
122	Lincoln Memorial University	Y	Y	Y		N	N	Y	N
123	Lincoln University (Missouri)	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	N	Y
124	Livingstone College	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y
125	Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
126	Lone Star Conference	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
127	Lynn University	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
128	Mansfield University of Pennsylvania	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
129	Mars Hill College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
130	Mercy College	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	N
131	Mercyhurst College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
132	Merrimack College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
133	Mesa State College								
134	Metropolitan State College of Denver	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	Y
135	Michigan Technological University	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
136	Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
137	Midwestern State University	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
138	Miles College								
139	Millersville University of Pennsylvania	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
140	Minnesota State University Mankato	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
141	Minnesota State University Moorhead	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
142	Missouri Southern State University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
143	Missouri Western State University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
144	Molloy College	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N
145	Montana State University-Billings	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y
146	Morehouse College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
147	Mount Olive College	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	N

Pad #	Institution/Conference	Proposal 4	Proposal 5	Proposal 6	Proposal 7	Proposal 8	Proposal 13	Proposal 15	Proposal 16
148	New Mexico Highlands University								
149	New York Institute of Technology	Y	Y	Y		N	N	Y	Y
150	Newberry College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
151	No. Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
152	North Carolina Central University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
153	North Greenville University								
154	Northeast-10 Conference	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
155	Northeastern State University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
156	Northern Kentucky University	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N
157	Northern Michigan University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
158	Northern State University	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
159	Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
160	Northwest Missouri State University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
161	Northwest Nazarene University	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y
162	Northwood University (Michigan)	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
163	Nova Southeastern University	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
164	Nyack College	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	Y
165	Oakland City University								
166	Ohio Valley University	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y
167	Oklahoma Panhandle State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
168	Ouachita Baptist University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	A
169	Pace University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
170	Paine College								
171	Peach Belt Conference	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
172	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
173	Pfeiffer University	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	N
174	Philadelphia University	Y	Y	N		N	N	N	N
175	Pittsburg State University	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
176	Post University								
177	Presbyterian College	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
178	Queens College (New York)	Y	Y	Y			Y	N	Y
179	Queens University of Charlotte								
180	Quincy University								
181	Regis University (Colorado)	Y	Y	Y		N	N	N	Y
182	Rockhurst University	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	Y
183	Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
184	Rollins College	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	N
185	Saginaw Valley State University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
186	Saint Anselm College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
187	Saint Joseph's College (Indiana)								
188	Saint Leo University	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y
189	Saint Michael's College	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	N	Y
190	Salem International University	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y
191	San Francisco State University	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N
192	Seattle Pacific University	Y	Y	N		N	Y	N	Y
193	Seattle University	Y	Y	N		N	Y	N	Y
194	Shaw University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
195	Shepherd University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
196	Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
197	Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
198	Sonoma State University	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	Y
199	South Atlantic Conference	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N
200	Southeastern Oklahoma State University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
201	Southern Arkansas University	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	N	Y
202	Southern Connecticut State University	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
203	Southern Illinois University Edwardsville	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
204	Southern Intercol. Ath. Conf.	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
205	Southern New Hampshire University	Y	Y	Y		N	N	N	N
206	Southwest Baptist University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
207	Southwest Minnesota State University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
208	Southwestern Oklahoma State University	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N
209	St. Andrews Presbyterian College	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	Y
210	St. Augustine's College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
211	St. Cloud State University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
212	St. Edward's University	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
213	St. Martin's University	Y	Y	Y		N	N	Y	N
214	St. Mary's University (Texas)	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	Y
215	St. Paul's College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
216	St. Thomas Aquinas College	Y	Y	Y					Y
217	Stillman College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
218	Stonehill College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
219	Sunshine State Conference	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
220	Tarleton State University	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
221	Texas A&M University-Commerce	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N

Pad #	Institution/Conference	Proposal 4	Proposal 5	Proposal 6	Proposal 7	Proposal 8	Proposal 13	Proposal 15	Proposal 16
222	Texas A&M University-Kingsville	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
223	Texas Woman's University	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
224	Tiffin University								
225	Truman State University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
226	Tusculum College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
227	Tuskegee University								
228	University of Alabama - Huntsville	Y	A	Y		Y	Y	N	Y
229	University of Alaska Anchorage	Y	Y	N		N	Y	N	Y
230	University of Alaska Fairbanks	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N
231	University of Arkansas - Monticello	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
232	University of Bridgeport	Y	Y	Y			Y	N	Y
233	University of California - San Diego	Y	Y	N		N	Y	N	Y
234	University of Central Missouri	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
235	University of Central Oklahoma	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
236	University of Charleston (West Virginia)	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
237	University of Colorado - Colorado Springs	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N
238	University of Findlay	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
239	University of Hawaii at Hilo	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y
240	University of Indianapolis	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
241	University of Massachusetts at Lowell	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	N
242	University of Minnesota Duluth	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
243	University of Minnesota - Crookston	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
244	University of Missouri - Rolla	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
245	University of Missouri - St. Louis	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	N
246	University of Montevallo	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
247	University of Nebraska at Kearney	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
248	University of Nebraska at Omaha	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
249	University of New Haven	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
250	University of North Alabama	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
251	University of North Carolina at Pembroke	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	Y
252	University of North Dakota	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
253	University of Pittsburgh - Johnstown	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	N
254	University of Puerto Rico - Bayamon								
255	University of Puerto Rico - Cayey								
256	University of Puerto Rico - Mayaguez Campus	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y
257	University of Puerto Rico - Rio Piedras								
258	University of South Carolina Aiken	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
259	University of South Carolina Upstate								
260	University of South Dakota	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
261	University of Southern Indiana	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	Y
262	University of Tampa	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
263	University of the District of Columbia	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		
264	University of the Incarnate Word	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	Y
265	University of the Sciences in Philadelphia	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N
266	University of West Alabama	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
267	University of West Florida	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	Y
268	University of West Georgia								
269	University of Wisconsin - Parkside	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	N	N
270	Upper Iowa University	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
271	Valdosta State University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
272	Virginia State University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
273	Virginia Union University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
274	Washburn University of Topeka	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
275	Wayne State College (Nebraska)	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
276	Wayne State University (Michigan)	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
277	West Chester University of Pennsylvania	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
278	West Liberty State College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
279	West Texas A&M University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
280	West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
281	West Virginia State University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
282	West Virginia Wesleyan College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
283	Western New Mexico University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
284	Western Oregon University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
285	Western State College of Colorado	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
286	Western Washington University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
287	Wheeling Jesuit University	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y
288	Wilmington College (Delaware)	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N
289	Wingate University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
290	Winona State University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Totals: Y		258	255	208	29	130	233	127	187
N		0	3	50	117	125	24	127	68
A		1	2	1	1	1	0	1	3
NP		31	30	31	143	34	33	35	32

Pad #	Institution/Conference	Proposal 4	Proposal 5	Proposal 6	Proposal 7	Proposal 8	Proposal 13	Proposal 15	Proposal 16
		Total	290	290	290	290	290	290	290
	Action:	PASSED	PASSED	PASSED	DEFEATED	PASSED	PASSED	DEFEATED	PASSED

101st Annual Convention

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

SUBMITTED BY THE MEMBERSHIP

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words that appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words that appear in **bold face** are to be added. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 2006-07 NCAA Division III Manual.]

DIVISION III LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

The NCAA Division III Presidents Council has determined that it will deal primarily with those national issues in Division III athletics that prompt widespread concern among Division III presidents or chancellors.

Legislative proposals developed by the Division III Management Council or by Division III committees reporting to it must be submitted to the Division III Presidents Council for review. They cannot be placed on the agenda for consideration at the Convention unless the Presidents Council agrees to sponsor them. This procedure was established to affirm presidential control of intercollegiate athletics in Division III.

The Division III Presidents Council has identified those proposals that it believes are of particular interest to Division III presidents or chancellors and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping. It should be noted, however, that inclusion of proposals in the Presidents Council grouping does not necessarily constitute a position by the Division III Presidents Council for or against a proposal. Those proposals with an asterisk before the proposal number have been identified by the Presidents Council as roll-call votes. Delegates should refer to each proposal's source line for information regarding the sponsor of each proposal.

Pursuant to Constitution 5.3.12, all amendments shall become effective not earlier than the first day of August following adoption at the NCAA Convention; however, if a voting delegate wishes to propose an immediate effective date, or to propose any other effective date before the first day of August, the proposal rationale statement shall contain reasons for the alternate effective date.

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL GROUPING

*NO. 1 (NO. 2-5) ETHICAL CONDUCT — SPORTS WAGERING ACTIVITIES

Intent: To specify and clarify prohibited sports wagering activities and the individuals to whom the prohibitions apply.

A. Bylaws: Amend 10, pages 45-46, as follows:
[Division III, roll call]

[To change the voting lines in Bylaws 10.3 and 10.4 from federated to common and to designate Bylaw 10.02 as common.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 10, pages 45-46, as follows:
[Division III, roll call]

“10 Ethical Conduct

“10.01 GENERAL PRINCIPLES

[10.01.1 unchanged.]

“10.02 DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS

“10.02.1 Sports Wagering. Sports wagering includes placing, accepting or soliciting a wager (on a staff member’s or student-athlete’s own behalf or on the behalf of others) of any type with any individual or organization on any intercollegiate, amateur or professional team or contest. Examples of sports wagering include, but are not limited to, the use of a bookmaker or parlay card; Internet sports wagering; auctions in which bids are placed on teams, individuals or contests; and pools or fantasy leagues in which an entry fee is required and there is an opportunity to win a prize.

“10.02.2 Wager. A wager is any agreement in which an individual or entity agrees to give up an item of value (e.g., cash, shirt, dinner) in exchange for the possibility of gaining another item of value.

[10.1 through 10.2 unchanged.]

“10.3 GAMBLING ACTIVITIES *Staff members of a member conference, staff members of the athletics department of a member institution and student-athletes shall not knowingly:*

“(a) *Provide information to individuals involved in organized gambling activities concerning intercollegiate athletics competition;*

“(b) *Solicit a bet on any intercollegiate team;*

“(c) *Accept a bet on any team representing the institution;*

“(d) *Solicit or accept a bet on any intercollegiate competition*

for any item (e.g., cash, shirt, dinner) that has tangible value; or

“(e) *Participate in any gambling activity that involves intercollegiate athletics or professional athletics, through a bookmaker, a parlay card or any other method employed by organized gambling.*

“10.3 SPORTS WAGERING ACTIVITIES. The following individuals shall not knowingly participate in sports wagering activities or provide information to individuals involved in or associated with any type of sports wagering activities concerning intercollegiate, amateur or professional athletics competition:

“(a) Staff members of an institution’s athletics department;

“(b) Nonathletics department staff members who have responsibilities within or over the athletics department (e.g., chancellor or president, faculty athletics representative, individual to whom athletics reports);

“(c) Staff members of a conference office; and

“(d) Student-athletes.

“10.3.1 Scope of Application. The prohibition against sports wagering applies to any institutional practice or any competition (intercollegiate, amateur or professional) in a sport in which the Association conducts championship competition, in bowl subdivision football and in emerging sports for women.

“10.3.1.1 Exception. The provisions of Bylaw 10.3 are not applicable to traditional wagers between institutions (e.g., traditional rivalry) or in conjunction with particular contests (e.g., bowl games). Items wagered must be representative of the involved institutions or the states in which they are located.

“10.3.1.2 Sanctions. The following sanctions for violations of Bylaw 10.3 shall apply as follows:

“(a) A student-athlete who engages in activities designed to influence the outcome of an intercollegiate contest or in an effort to affect win-loss margins (i.e., “point shaving”) or who solicits or accepts a bet or participates in any gambling activity through a bookmaker, a parlay card or any other method employed by organized gambling that involves sports wagering on activity involving the student-athlete’s institution shall permanently lose all remaining regular-season and postseason eligibility in all sports.

“(b) A student-athlete who *solicits or accepts a bet or participates in any gambling sports wagering activity that involves intercollegiate, athletics or professional athletics, through the Internet, a bookmaker, or a parlay card or any other method employed by organized gambling*, shall be ineligible for all regular-season and postseason competition for a minimum of a period of one year from the date of the institution’s determination that a violation has occurred and shall be charged with a loss of a minimum of one season of *participation eligibility*. A request for reinstatement may be submitted on behalf of a student-athlete who has participated in such activity only upon fulfillment of the minimum condition indicated above. If the student-athlete is determined to have been involved in a subsequent violation of any portion of Bylaw 10.3, the student-athlete shall permanently lose all remaining regular-season and postseason eligibility in all sports.

“10.4 DISCIPLINARY ACTION. Prospective student-athletes found in violation of the provisions of this regulation shall be ineligible for further intercollegiate competition, subject to appeal to the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement for restoration of eligibility (See Bylaw 10.3.12 for sanctions of student-athletes involved in violations of Bylaw 10.3). Institutional staff members found in violation of the provisions of this regulation shall be subject to disciplinary or corrective action as set forth in Bylaw 19.5.2.2 of the NCAA enforcement procedures, whether such violations occurred at the certifying institution or during the individual’s previous employment at another member institution.”

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: The legislation regarding sports wagering activities must specifically define the individuals who are covered and the activities that are expressly prohibited. Given the serious consequences (e.g., ineligibility, loss of employment) for violating this bylaw, it is imperative that it be clearly worded and easily understood by the membership. Adding individuals who are involved in intercollegiate athletics, such as the faculty athletics representative and the president or chancellor to the list of persons precluded from participation in sports wagering activities establishes that the rule is uniform in its application. It is important to note that, as a human resources policy, the NCAA national office staff is covered by this prohibition on sports wa-

gering activities. The staff is not mentioned in the proposal because NCAA bylaws are only applicable to member institutions and conferences. Student-athletes, coaches, administrators, faculty athletics representatives and presidents or chancellors and/or the individual with oversight of athletics all are unequivocally subject to the rule.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

*NO. 2 (NO. 2-7) PERSONNEL — CONDUCT OF ATHLETICS PERSONNEL — SPORTS SAFETY TRAINING

Intent: To specify that at least one individual certified in first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and automatic external defibrillator (AED) use and familiar with emergency plan activation policies shall be physically present at each required practice, competition and strength and conditioning session involving student-athletes.

A. Bylaws: Amend 11.1 by adding new 11.1.4, page 47, as follows:
[Division III, roll call]

“11.1 CONDUCT OF ATHLETICS PERSONNEL

[11.1.1 through 11.1.3 unchanged.]

“11.1.4 Sports Safety Training. At least one individual certified in first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and automatic external defibrillator (AED) use and familiar with emergency plan activation policies shall be physically present at each required practice, competition and strength and conditioning session involving student-athletes.”

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.1, by adding new 17.1.11, pages 126-133, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

[17.1.1 through 17.1.10 unchanged.]

“17.1.11 Sports Safety Presence. All required practice, competition and strength and conditioning sessions involving student-athletes shall have physically present at least one individual certified in first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and automatic external defibrillator (AED) use and familiar with emergency plan activation policies.”

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: A survey of the NCAA death claims since 1992 reports 60 percent of all nonvehicle related deaths have been due to

heart-related conditions and 83 percent of all deaths occurred during practice or conditioning. The goal of this proposal is to ensure that someone certified in first aid, CPR and AED is physically present at required practice, competition and strength and conditioning sessions to care for all participating student-athletes. The training should be consistent with certification from a nationally recognized organization in first aid, CPR and AED. It is important to note that Division III grant and initiative funding may be used to purchase an AED.

Committee Position (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports):

Estimated Financial Impact: Minimal for certification (\$0 to \$30 per coach) since institutions can outsource the training or train their own staffs as instructors. Moreover, this is not an annual cost since first aid certification is good for three years and CPR certification is valid for one to two years. Payment for the AED may come from Division III grant and initiative funding.

*NO. 3 (NO. 2-12) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — PRESEASON PRACTICE — MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS

Intent: To require prospective student-athletes and student-athletes to undergo a medical examination administered or supervised by a physician prior to initial participation in any required conditioning, practice or competition activities; further, to require an updated medical history each subsequent year the student-athlete participates.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.1, pages 126-133, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

[Division III, roll call]

“17.1 GENERAL PLAYING-SEASON REGULATIONS.

[17.1.1 through 17.1.4 unchanged.]

“17.1.5 Mandatory Medical Examination. Prior to participation in any practice, competition or out-of-season conditioning activities (or, in Division I, permissible voluntary summer conditioning in basketball and football or voluntary individual workouts pursuant to the safety exception), student-athletes who are beginning their initial season of eligibility shall be required to undergo a medical examination or evaluation administered or supervised by a physician (e.g., family physician, team physician). The examination or evaluation must be administered within six months prior to participation in any practice, competition or out-of-season conditioning activities. In following years, an updated history of the student-athlete’s medical condition shall be adminis-

tered by an institutional medical staff member (e.g., sports medicine staff, team physician) to determine if additional examinations (e.g., physical, cardiovascular, neurological) are required. The updated history must be administered within six months prior to the student-athlete’s participation in any practice, competition or out-of-season conditioning activities for the applicable academic year.”

[17.1.5 through 17.1.10 renumbered as 17.1.6 through 17.1.11, unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.11.2, pages 150-151, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“17.11.2 Preseason Practice.

[17.11.2.1 unchanged.]

“17.11.2.2 Activities Prior to First Practice Date. Prior to participation in any preseason activities, all prospects and student-athletes shall be required to undergo a medical examination or evaluation administered or supervised by a physician.”

[17.11.2.3 through 17.11.2.4 renumbered as 17.11.2.2 through 17.11.2.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: Before student-athletes and prospective student-athletes accept the rigors of organized sport, their health should be evaluated by qualified medical personnel. All participants have a medical examination upon initial entrance to the sport at the intercollegiate level. During subsequent years, an interim history should be administered to determine if additional examinations are required. Currently, there is an inconsistency as to when athletes receive physicals and variability in the type of exams. This physical examination requirement is currently in place for football and all prospects and student-athletes should have a pre-participation examination. Due to the inconsistency in medical forms used nationwide, it is highly recommended the forms within the “Pre-participation Physical Examination” monograph be used as a minimal standard since the publication has been endorsed by the American Academy of Family Physicians, American Academy of Pediatrics, American College of Sports Medicine, American Medical Society for Sports Medicine and American Osteopathic Academy of Sports Medicine. Each institution should provide its own pre-participation examination form based on these minimal standards, which includes a thorough history, physical examination and screening for cardiovascular conditions.

Estimated Financial Impact: The institution, student-athlete or prospect may be responsible to pay for the physical examination and/or evaluation.

***NO. 4 (NO. 2-13) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —
NONTRADITIONAL SEGMENT —
LIMITATIONS ON ATHLETICALLY
RELATED ACTIVITY AND
COMPETITION ACTIVITY ON THE ONE
DATE OF COMPETITION**

Intent: To specify a limit of eight hours of athletically related activity on the one date of competition in the nontraditional segment and to limit competition activity on the one date of competition in non-traditional segment, as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 17.1.9.4, page 133, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

*“17.1.9.4 Traditional and Nontraditional Segment Length - Baseball, Field Hockey, Lacrosse, Soccer, Softball and Women’s Volleyball. **The nontraditional segment shall be subject to the following limitations:***

*“(a) All practice and competition *during the nontraditional segment* shall be limited to a maximum of five weeks.;*

“(b) A maximum of 16 days of athletically related activity with no more than four days of athletically related activity in any one week, shall be permitted.;

*“(c) **Any athletically related activity (see Bylaw 17.02.1.1) by any member of the applicable team shall constitute the use of a day;***

*“(d) One date of competition may occur *during the nontraditional segment* and shall be counted as one of the 16 permissible days of athletically related activity.;*

“Any athletically related activity (see Bylaw 17.02.1.1) by any member of the applicable team shall constitute the use of a day.

*“(e) **A maximum of eight hours of athletically related activity may occur on the one date of competition for all participants. Further, competition activity on the one date must be included in the eight-hour maximum and is also limited to the following:***

*“(1) **Baseball — two regulation baseball games or 18 innings.***

*“(2) **Field Hockey — two regulation field hockey contests or 140 minutes of competition activity.***

*“(3) **Men’s and Women’s Lacrosse — two regulation lacrosse contests or 120 minutes of competition activity.***

*“(4) **Men’s and Women’s Soccer — two regulation soc-***

cer contests or 180 minutes of competition activity.

*“(5) **Softball — three regulation softball games or 21 innings.***

*“(6) **Volleyball — 15 regulation volleyball games.”***

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee)].

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: This proposal addresses concerns surrounding student-athlete health and well-being linked to the proliferation of excessive athletic and competition activities (e.g., 100 inning baseball games) that occur on the one date of competition in the nontraditional segment. By outlining an overall eight hour athletically related activity limit and competition activity limit for each sport, student-athletes are able to participate fully in athletic and competition activities on the one date of competition without endangering their health and well-being. The time limits for competition activity in specified sports provide teams with the flexibility to conduct shorter games (e.g., six 30-minute soccer games; seven 20-minute field hockey contests) in order to maximize competition opportunities for all participants and incorporate unique tournament or competition formats traditionally associated with the one date of competition. In sports that do not regulate competition by a time limit, an appropriate amount of competition activity based on a relevant standard (e.g., innings for baseball and softball, games for volleyball) was established noting the normal amount of time to complete regulation contests in those sports. Feedback and recommendations from each sport committee was considered before making this legislative recommendation.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

***NO. 5 (NO. 2-8) RECRUITING — TRYOUTS —
PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES — TRYOUT
CAMPS**

Intent: To prohibit an institution from hosting or sponsoring a tryout camp, clinic, group workout or combine event at any location.

Bylaws: Amend 13.11.1.5, page 77, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

*“13.11.1.5 Tryout **Camps Events.** A member institution or conference may not **host, sponsor or** conduct a tryout camp, **clinic, group workout or combine (e.g., combination of athletics skill test or activities)** devoted to agility, flexibility, speed and strength tests for prospective student-athletes **at any location.** A member institution’s staff members may *not only* attend such a *tryout camp* **an event** sponsored by an outside organiza-*

tion if the camp invites only representatives from selected institutions or conferences to observe the camp **event occurs off the institution's campus and is open to all institutions.**"

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: Current legislation prohibits an institution from conducting a tryout camp that is intended to test the agility, flexibility, speed and strength of prospective student-athletes. However, institutions are not prohibited from hosting tryout camps conducted by a noninstitutional entity. The involvement of some institutions in hosting these tryout events creates pressure for other institutions to also serve as hosts for tryout camps. Adding hosting and sponsoring tryout camps to the list of prohibited recruiting activities will extend the tryout camp prohibition to meet the expectation of the original legislation.

Estimated Financial Impact: This proposal could impact revenue generated from renting out institutional athletics facilities.

***NO. 6 (NO. 2-9) ELIGIBILITY — GENERAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS — MALE PRACTICE PLAYER ELIGIBILITY — REQUIREMENTS**

Intent: To establish requirements for the use of male practice players as follows: male practice players shall only be permitted to practice in the traditional segment; use is limited to one practice per week, and the number of male practice players for each team sport shall not exceed half of the number of student-athletes required to field a starting unit in that sport.

Bylaws: Amend 14.1.11 by adding new 14.1.11.1, page 91, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"14.1.11.1 Requirements. The use of male practice players in a women's sport is subject to the following requirements:

"(a) Male practice players shall only be permitted to practice in the traditional segment in the women's sport;

"(b) The use of male practice players is limited to one practice per week; and

"(c) In team sports, the number of male practice players shall not exceed half of the number of student-athletes required to field a starting unit in that sport."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: The use of male practice players takes away practice opportunities for female student-athletes. Women's athletics has developed significantly in the past 25 years and it is no longer appropriate to rely on male practice players to serve as scout teams or to focus only on males to simulate a taller or faster female opponent. The use of male practice players should not be totally prohibited, as using male practice players enables some women's teams with small rosters to field an appropriate number of players for competitive drills. In this case, participation of male practice players supplements the practice experience and furthers the goal of providing better practice opportunities for female student-athletes. It should be noted that existing legislation requires that male practice players be certified as eligible under all applicable NCAA eligibility requirements (e.g., the individual must be enrolled in a minimum full-time program of studies, sign a student-athlete statement and drug testing consent form and have eligibility remaining under the 10-semester/15-quarter rule). Further, male practice players do use seasons of participation with women's teams.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

***NO. 6-1 ELIGIBILITY — GENERAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS — MALE PRACTICE PLAYER ELIGIBILITY — REQUIREMENTS**

Intent: To amend 2007 NCAA Convention Proposal No. 6 to specify that the use of male practice players is limited to three practices per week and the number of male practice players for each team sport shall not exceed the number of student-athletes required to field a starting unit in that sport.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 6, 14.1.11.1, page 91, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"14.1.11.1 Requirements. The use of male practice players in a women's sport is subject to the following requirements:

"(a) Male practice players shall only be permitted to practice in the traditional segment in the women's sport;

"(b) The use of male practice players is limited to *one three* practices per week; and

"(c) In team sports, the number of male practice players shall not exceed *half of* the number of student-athletes required to field a starting unit in that sport."

Source: Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: This proposal amends 2007 NCAA Convention Proposal No. 6 and would permit the use of male practice players in up to three practices per week as opposed to one and, in team sports, permit the

number of male practice players to be equal to the number of student-athletes required to field a starting unit in that sport as opposed to half of the starting unit. These modifications will provide coaches the flexibility to use male practice players in an effective and efficient manner. Male practice players are often used as scout teams to prepare for opponents during the regular season. These modifications do not compromise the original intent of the proposal and will continue to ensure appropriate and ample practice time for all the female members of the team.

Committee Position: This amendment-to-amendment was not submitted in time for an official committee position to be included in the Convention Notice. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and the Management Council's Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee will forward recommended positions to the Management and Presidents Councils for consideration during their pre-convention meetings.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

***NO. 7 (NO. 2-11) ELIGIBILITY — SEASONS OF PARTICIPATION — PARTICIPATION AT ANY COLLEGIATE INSTITUTION**

Intent: To specify that participation at any collegiate institution shall constitute the use of a season of participation.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.4.1, page 92, as follows:
[Division III, roll call]

"14.2.4.1 Minimum Amount of Participation. A season of intercollegiate participation shall be counted when a student-athlete participates (practices or competes) during or after the first contest following the student-athlete's initial participation at that institution. A season of participation shall not be counted when a student-athlete participates in a preseason scrimmage or preseason exhibition conducted prior to the first contest following the student-athlete's initial participation at that institution. This provision is applicable to intercollegiate athletics participation (practice or competition) conducted by a *Division III* any collegiate institution at the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team level."

Source: Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2007, for participation occurring on or after August 1, 2007

Rationale: In 2004, legislation was adopted indicating that student-athletes who practice during a sport season without competing (e.g., redshirting) are considered to have used a season of participation. However, student-athletes outside of Division III retain a season of participation by redshirting. This practice should not be permissible for those Division I and II student-

athletes who decide to transfer to a Division III institution. The current rule allows student-athletes transferring into Division III an additional season of participation that the student-athletes who participate in Division III for their entire collegiate careers do not receive. Eligibility should remain fair and consistent for all student-athletes who participate within Division III. Transferring student-athletes should make decisions to transfer to Division III because they have decided that an academic program or a different campus environment is in their best interest. Just as most Division III educational programs are designed to last four years, so too should Division III athletics participation even if a student-athlete's participation began at a non-Division III institution. This proposal should not be viewed as a penalty for student-athletes who participate in Divisions I and II, but an affirmation that Division III is committed to permitting four seasons of participation for any student-athlete.

Committee Position (Presidents Council, Management Council and Interpretations and Legislation Committee): The Presidents Council, Management Council, and Interpretations and Legislation Committee oppose this proposal for student-athlete well-being considerations including a lack of notice to non-Division III student-athletes about the Division III season of participation standard.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

***NO. 8 (NO. 2-10) ELIGIBILITY — CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING SEASON OF PARTICIPATION — MINIMUM AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION — NONTRADITIONAL SEGMENT**

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete shall not use a season of participation for engaging in practice activities at any time during the nontraditional segment.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.4.1, pages 92-93, as follows:
[Division III, roll call]

"14.2.4.1 Minimum Amount of Participation. A season of intercollegiate participation shall be counted when a student-athlete participates (practices or competes) during or after the first contest **in the traditional segment** following the student-athlete's initial participation that academic year at that institution **or when the student-athlete engages in intercollegiate competition during the nontraditional segment.** *A season of participation shall not be counted when a student-athlete participates in a preseason scrimmage or preseason exhibition conducted prior to the first contest following the student-athlete's initial participation of that academic year at that institution.* This provision is applicable to intercollegiate athletics participation (practice or competition) conducted by a Division III col-

legiate institution at the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team level.

“14.2.4.1.1 Exception. A student-athlete may practice in the nontraditional segment without counting a season of participation if the student-athlete missed the traditional segment for academic reasons (excluding academic probation or ineligibility) as certified by the academic authorities at the institution. A season of participation shall not be counted during the traditional segment when a student-athlete participates in a preseason scrimmage or preseason exhibition conducted prior to the first contest following the student-athlete’s initial participation of that academic year at that institution.”

Source: Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, Great Northeast Athletic Conference and Northwest Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2007, for participation occurring on or after August 1, 2007.

Rationale: Currently, inequities exist between fall and spring sports with respect to the amount of practice time that a student-athlete may engage in prior to being charged with a season of participation. This amendment will significantly reduce the inequities and will result in considerably less confusion and misapplication of the rules pertaining to seasons of participation as well as lessen the complexities and administrative burden associated with tracking these activities. The likelihood that a student-athlete will be charged unknowingly with a season of participation and other rules violations will be reduced. It also should be noted that this amendment does not alter the fact that a student-athlete who engages in outside competition during the nontraditional season is charged with a season of participation.

Committee Position (Presidents Council): The Presidents Council opposes this proposal as it dilutes the season of participation standard adopted as part of the Division III reform package at the 2004 Convention. The Presidents Council is concerned about the equitable treatment of fall and spring student-athletes under the season of participation standard and recommends the issue be addressed by the appropriate Division III committee.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

***NO. 9 (NO. 2-3) DIVISION MEMBERSHIP — PROVISIONAL AND RECLASSIFYING MEMBERSHIP — APPLICATION STANDARDS AND COMPLIANCE WITH DIVISION REGULATIONS**

Intent: To amend the provisional and reclassifying member process to establish a maximum entering class size of four, increase the educational fee to \$20,000, establish specified application approval criteria, establish specified priorities for the placement of an institution in a class and require full compliance with all Division III regulations during each year of provisional or reclassifying membership except for financial aid limitations.

A. Constitution: Amend 3.6.3, page 17, as follows:
[Division III, roll call]

“3.6.3 Election Procedures

“3.6.3.1 Application. An institution desiring to become a provisional member of this Association must complete a one year “exploratory period” prior to application and attend a required information meeting. The applicant institution must register with the national office by June 1 in order to start this period. Following the exploratory period, the applicant shall apply on a form available from the national office. **Provisional applications shall be approved based on the standards in Bylaw 20.3.1.**

“3.6.3.1.1 Educational Fee - Provisional Members. Each provisional member shall pay a nonrefundable *educational* fee of \$12,000 **20,000**, as determined by the Membership Committee and approved by the Management Council. At the time of registration for the exploratory year, \$500 shall be due, and \$225**19,500** shall be due by *June* **September 1** of each year the institution waits to begin the provisional membership process after application. *By June 1 prior to provisional year one \$6,000 less the amount already paid shall be due. The final \$6,000 shall be due by June 1 prior to provisional year three.* **the first year of provisional membership.** Provisional members in years one through four shall also pay NCAA dues.

[Remainder of 3.6.3 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 20.3, pages 210-212, as follows:
[Division III, roll call]

“20.3 PROVISIONAL MEMBERSHIP

“20.3.1 Application Standards. After it has been determined that the institution meets the Association’s requirement of acceptable academic standards (per Constitution 3.6.3.2), the application shall be approved, provided the applicant institution satisfies all of the following standards at the time of application:

“(a) Compliance during the year immediately preceding the application with all sports-sponsorship requirements per Bylaw 20.11.3 and its subsections. This includes, but is not limited to, the number of varsity intercollegiate sports an institution must sponsor and the minimum contest and participant requirements for sports sponsorship;

“(b) Satisfactory completion of a viability statement describing the institution’s commitment to the Division III philosophy statement (see Bylaw 20.11). The Membership Committee shall make available the viability statement form as part of the provisional member application;

“(c) Sponsorship by an active Division III member, including the establishment of a good-faith mentoring relationship and submission of a letter of recommendation signed by the sponsoring institution’s president or chancellor, athletics director, senior woman administrator, and faculty athletics representative; and

“(d) Demonstration of a functioning compliance system. The Membership Committee shall make available the compliance assessment form as part of the provisional member application.

“20.3.2 Class Size and Assignment. There shall be a maximum of four institutions admitted to the provisional or reclassifying membership program in any one year (see Bylaw 20.6.2.1.2). Institutions shall be assigned a start year based on the following criteria:

“(a) Geographic location in an area that needs or can accept new members;

“(b) Reclassifying versus provisional status;

“(c) Existing or potential membership in an active Division III conference; and

“(d) Broad-based sports sponsorship profile.

“20.3.13 Four-Year Provision. Provisional membership shall not be less than a four-year period. At the end of the four-year period, a provisional member shall be eligible to apply for active membership (see Constitution 3.2.3).

“20.3.13.1 Waivers.

“20.3.13.1.1 General. At the completion of year two of the provisional membership process, an institution may apply for a waiver of the four-year provisional membership process. The Management Council, on recommendation from the Membership Committee, may grant waivers of the four-year provision based on compelling evidence that the institution has:

“(a) Satisfied sports sponsorship requirements (includ-

ing minimum contests and participant requirements) in years one and two;

“(b) Not awarded institutional financial aid based on athletics during any provisional year;

“(c) Completed a successful financial aid report;

“(d) Attended all required functions for provisional members (e.g., NCAA Convention, NCAA Rules Regional Seminar);

“(e) Completed a successful year two on-campus visit;

“(f) Displayed evidence of a properly functioning athletics compliance system. The preliminary program assessment shall be submitted with the waiver request;

“(g) Not been required to repeat any year of provisional membership;

“(h) Displayed evidence of effective mentoring by the Membership Committee or other Division III members; and

“(i) Satisfied all other membership requirements.

“20.3.13.1.2 Credit for Time Completed Previously as Provisional Member. The Management Council, on recommendation of the Membership Committee, may waive any portion of the first two years of the four-year provisional period the institution previously completed as a provisional member, provided the portion was completed within the last 10 years.

“20.3.13.1.3 Reclassification of Provisional Membership from Division II to Division III. The Division III Management Council, on recommendation from the Division III Membership Committee, may waive one year of the four-year provisional membership period if an institution reclassifies its provisional membership from Division II to Division III. The waiver may be granted only if the institution meets Division III financial aid requirements and the minimum contest and participant requirements during its previous year of provisional membership. The institution shall serve a minimum of four total years of provisional membership before being considered for active membership. An institution that reclassifies its provisional membership from Division II to Division III shall comply with the provisional membership legislation in effect at the time of its reclassification.

“20.3.24 Compliance with Association Rules. **Unless specified otherwise in Bylaw 20.4**, a provisional member shall administer its athletics program in accordance with the constitution, bylaws and other legislation of the Association.

“20.3.2.1 Four-Year Progression. *Unless specified otherwise in Bylaw 20.3, during the first and second years of provisional membership, an institution shall apply the legislation*

of the Association to the greatest extent possible. During the third and fourth years of provisional membership, an institution shall administer its athletics program in accordance with the constitution, bylaws and other legislation of the Association. The third and fourth years of provisional membership must be completed consecutively.

“20.3.2.1.1 Waiver. The Management Council, on recommendation from the Membership Committee, may waive the requirement that the third and fourth years of provisional membership be completed consecutively.

“20.3.24.21 Athletically Related Financial Aid Prohibition **Exception.** A provisional member shall not award new athletically related financial aid to incoming students (e.g., freshmen, transfers) beginning with the first year of provisional membership and thereafter. Following the completion of year two, a provisional member may no longer award athletically related financial aid to any student. During the second year of provisional membership (and each subsequent year), a provisional member must complete the *Division III* financial aid reporting process (see Bylaw 15.4.1.1).

[20.3.2.3 through 20.3.2.4 renumbered as 20.3.4.2 through 20.3.4.3, unchanged.]

[20.3.3 renumbered as 20.3.5, unchanged.]

“20.3.46 Sports Sponsorship Requirement.

“20.3.4.1 First Year of Provisional Membership. Institutions in the first year of provisional membership shall sponsor the number of sports required in Bylaw 20.11.3. An institution is not required to meet contest and participant minimums to count the sport. Further, an institution is not required to meet contest and participant minimums to satisfy the requirement to sponsor one team sport each season (see Bylaw 20.11.3.3).

“20.3.4.2 Second, Third and Fourth Years of Provisional Membership. **During each year of provisional membership,** institutions in the second, third and fourth years of provisional membership shall meet all requirements for sports sponsorship as set forth in Bylaw 20.11.3.

“20.3.57 Conditions and Obligations of Provisional Membership.

“20.3.57.1 Education Program. Each provisional member must complete the provisional member education program prior to being granted active membership. The Membership Committee shall administer this program, which is described on the NCAA Web site (i.e., “20.3.57.2 Determination of Provisional Membership Standing. A provisional member may be permitted to continue the four-year provisional member process with or without conditions as determined by the Membership Committee in instances of non-compliance with Division III and/or provisional membership regulations.

“20.3.57.3 Repeat of Provisional Membership. The Management Council, on recommendation from the Membership Committee, may require a provisional member to repeat any one of the four years of the provisional membership period. An institution may repeat only once during the four-year provisional membership period.

“20.3.57.4 First Year of Active Division III Membership. The Management Council, on recommendation from the Membership Committee, shall have the authority to place an institution that has completed its provisional process in restricted membership status for its first year of active Division III membership. The Membership Committee shall establish the parameters of restricted membership, which may include, but are not limited to, loss of any or all championship access, voting privileges, Division III grant and initiative funding and catastrophic injury insurance.”

C. Bylaws: Amend 20.6.2, pages 213-214, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“20.6.2 Requesting Reclassification to Division III — **Election Procedures**

“20.6.2.1 *Deadline for Submission of Petition Application.* When petitioning for change of division membership, a member shall notify the Membership Committee apply on **submit** a form approved by the Membership Committee available from the national office. The form shall be received in the national office (by mail or wired transmission) not later than June 1. Any form received after that date shall be postmarked not later than May 25. Reclassifying members shall pay an educational fee of \$12,000. One-half of the educational fee must accompany the petition. The remainder of the educational fee must be paid at the start of year three. In addition, reclassifying members must also pay the appropriate amount of annual dues each year.

“20.6.2.1.1 **Application Standards.** The application shall be approved based on the applicant institution meeting all of the standards described for provisional applicants. See Bylaw 20.3.1.

“20.6.2.1.2 **Class Size and Assignment.** See Bylaw 20.3.2.

“20.6.2.1.3 **Fee.** Reclassifying members shall pay a fee of \$20,000 which must accompany the petition. In addition, reclassifying members must also pay the appropriate amount of annual dues each year.

“20.6.2.2 *Compliance with Criteria.* If the member has met all applicable membership criteria of this article for Division III and has complied for the four years preceding June 1 with all other Division III requirements, the member shall be transferred to Division III effective the September 1 that the institution selects as its effective date. During the reclassification period, an institution must submit a written annual report to the national office

not later than June 1 each year, in accordance with Bylaw 20.6.2.2.4.

“20.6.2.2.1 First Year of Active Division III Membership. The Management Council, on recommendation from the Membership Committee, shall have the authority to place an institution that has completed its reclassification process in restricted membership status for its first year of active Division III membership. The Membership Committee shall establish the parameters of restricted membership, which may include, but are not limited to, loss of any or all championships access, voting privileges, Division III grants and initiatives and catastrophic injury insurance.

“20.6.2.2.2 Waiver. At the completion of year two of the reclassifying membership process, an institution may apply for a waiver of the four-year reclassification process. The Management Council, on recommendation from the Membership Committee, may grant waivers of the four-year reclassification process based on compelling evidence the institution has:

- “(a) Satisfied sports sponsorship requirements (including minimum contests and participant requirements) in years one and two;*
- “(b) Not awarded institutional financial aid based on athletics during any reclassifying year;*
- “(c) Completed a successful financial aid report;*
- “(d) Attended all required functions for reclassifying members (e.g., NCAA Convention, NCAA Rules Regional Seminar);*
- “(e) Completed a successful year two on-campus visit;*
- “(f) Displayed evidence of a properly functioning athletics compliance system. The preliminary program assessment shall be submitted with the waiver request;*
- “(g) Not been required to repeat any year of reclassifying membership;*
- “(h) Displayed evidence of effective mentoring by the Membership Committee or other Division III members; and*
- “(i) Satisfied all other membership requirements.*

“20.6.2.2.3 Athletically Related Financial Aid Prohibition. A reclassifying member shall not award athletically related financial aid to incoming students (e.g., freshman, transfer) beginning with the first year of the reclassification process and thereafter. Following the completion of year two, a reclassifying member may no longer award athletically related financial aid to any student and must comply with all financial aid requirements set forth in Bylaw 15.4. During the second year of reclassification (and each subsequent year), a reclassifying member must complete the Division III financial aid electronic reporting

process (see Bylaw 15.4.1.1).

“20.6.2.2.4 Institutional Self-Study and Annual Review Requirements. An institution reclassifying into Division III must complete an Institutional Self-Study Guide (ISSG) during the first year of its four-year compliance period. Additionally, an institution reclassifying to Division III must participate in the provisional member education program and must provide, on an annual basis, a written report to be reviewed by the Membership Committee on behalf of the Management Council describing the institution’s progress in meeting active membership requirements. The annual report shall be received in the national office not later than June 1 and shall be on a form approved by the Management Council.

“20.6.2.2.5 Administration of Rules Test. A reclassifying member must administer the Division III Rules Test to its coaching staff members prior to the completion of year two of the reclassification process.

“20.6.2.3 Three-Year Requirement. Once the change of division membership has been approved, the institution shall remain classified in that division for a minimum of three years.

“20.6.2.4 Reclassification of Provisional Membership from Division II to Division III. The Management Council, on recommendation from the Membership Committee, may waive one year of the four-year provisional membership period if an institution reclassifies its provisional membership from Division II to Division III. The waiver may be granted only if the institution meets Division III financial aid requirements and the minimum contest and participant requirements during its previous year of provisional membership. The institution shall serve a minimum of four total years of provisional membership before being considered for active membership.

“20.6.2.5 Repeat of Reclassification Membership. The Management Council, on recommendation from the Membership Committee, may require a reclassifying member to repeat any one of the four years of the reclassifying membership period. An institution may repeat only once during the four-year reclassifying membership period.

“20.6.3 Election. The Management Council, on the recommendation of the Membership Committee, shall elect the applicant to reclassifying membership effective the following September 1. The applicant shall be notified on completion of the election process.

“20.6.4 Four-Year Provision. Reclassifying membership shall not be less than a four-year period. At the end of the four-year period, a reclassifying member shall be eligible for active membership (see Constitution 3.2.3).

“20.6.4.1 Waiver. At the completion of year two of the reclassifying membership process, an institution may

apply for a waiver of the four-year reclassification process, consistent with the waiver available for the four-year provisional membership process. See Bylaw 20.3.1.1.1.

“20.6.5 Compliance with Division III Rules. Unless specified otherwise in Bylaw 20.6.5.1, a reclassifying member shall administer its athletics program in accordance with the Constitution, bylaws and other legislation of the Association.

“20.6.5.1 Athletically Related Financial Aid Exception. A reclassifying member shall not award athletically related financial aid to incoming students (e.g., freshman, transfer) beginning with the first year of the reclassification process and thereafter. Following the completion of year two, a reclassifying member may no longer award athletically related financial aid to any student and must comply with all financial aid requirements set forth in Bylaw 15.4. During the second year of reclassification (and each subsequent year), a reclassifying member must complete the financial aid reporting process (See Bylaw 15.4.1.1).

“20.6.6 Standards. The institution’s athletics programs shall reflect the establishment and maintenance of high standards of personal honor, eligibility and fair play.

“20.6.7 Sports Sponsorship Requirement. During each year of reclassifying membership, institutions shall meet all requirements for sports sponsorship as set forth in Bylaw 20.11.3.

“20.6.8 Conditions and Obligations of Reclassifying Membership

“20.6.8.1 Education Program. Each reclassifying member must complete the provisional member education program administered by the Membership Committee prior to being granted active membership.

“20.6.8.2 Determination of Reclassifying Membership Standing. A reclassifying member may be permitted to continue the four-year reclassifying member process with or without conditions as determined by the Membership Committee in instances of noncompliance with Division III and/or reclassifying membership regulations.

“20.6.8.3 Repeat of Reclassifying Membership. The Management Council, on recommendation from the Membership Committee, may require a reclassifying member to repeat any one of the four years of the reclassifying membership period. An institution may repeat only once during the four-year reclassifying membership period.

“20.6.8.4 First Year of Active Division III Membership.

The Management Council, on recommendation from the Membership Committee, shall have the authority to place an institution that has completed its reclassification process in restricted membership status for its first year of active Division III membership. The Membership Committee shall establish the parameters of restricted membership, which may include, but are not limited to, loss of any or all championships access, voting privileges, Division III grants and initiatives and catastrophic injury insurance.

“20.6.8.5 Three-Year Requirement. Once the change of division membership has been approved, the institution shall remain classified in that division for a minimum of three years.”

[20.6.3 through 20.6.4 renumbered as 20.6.9 through 20.6.10 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: The Division III membership has grown significantly over time and the resulting size and diversity of our membership present many challenges. One challenge is philosophical. The governance structure has sponsored proposals in recent years to help ensure that Division III members administer athletics consistent with the Division III philosophy. A second challenge is administrative. Growth has created greater demand for national office services. Working with a fixed budget, the division has attempted to enhance access to a quality championships program and initiatives that bolster the academic and personal success of student-athletes. This proposal presents a sound growth strategy for Division III by admitting only those institutions fully committed to the Division III philosophy and that exhibit the ability to meet all Division III regulations. Prior experience shows that only a limited number of provisional members would have been able to meet these new requirements. Further, the proposal establishes several mechanisms that ensure new Division III members are fully prepared for active membership by establishing a mentoring relationship with an active member and increasing tools for establishing an effective compliance system.

Estimated Financial Impact: This proposal increases the provisional and reclassifying member fee from \$12,000 to \$20,000 to cover the costs associated with new educational and compliance programming.

***NO. 10 (NO. 2-1) DIVISION MEMBERSHIP —
CONDITIONS AND OBLIGATIONS OF
MEMBERSHIP — EDUCATIONAL
INITIATIVES**

Intent: To amend active membership requirements to require attendance at the NCAA Convention and NCAA Regional Rules Seminar, to require administration of the Division III rules test to all head coaches and individuals with compliance oversight and to provide compliance tools to institutions placed on probation or in restricted status; further, to specify that the Membership Committee shall audit the results and action plans of completed Institutional Self-Study Guides and audit institutionally submitted sports-sponsorship information.

A. Constitution: Amend 3.02.3.1.2, pages 7-8, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“3.02.3.1.2 Membership Classification Status

“3.02.3.1.2.1 Probation is a membership classification status assigned to an institution that indicates that an institution’s membership is not in good standing. The status of probation serves as a warning that certain conditions and obligations of membership have not been satisfied and failure to correct such deficiencies shall result in the institution’s reclassification to the category of restricted membership. **During the probationary year, the institution shall be required to complete an athletics program assessment using a form approved by the Membership Committee and shall also be provided with the guiding principles to establish a model Division III athletics program.** An institution does not lose membership benefits as a result of being placed on probation.

“3.02.3.1.2.2 Restricted. Restricted membership is a membership classification status assigned to an institution that fails to comply with the minimum requirements of its division (e.g., sports sponsorship) and has failed during its period of probation to rectify such deficiencies as identified by the Division III Membership Committee or Committee on Infractions. The institution placed in such status is subject to loss of eligibility for a number of membership privileges, including but not limited to championships eligibility, voting privileges, Division III grant and initiative funding and catastrophic injury insurance. The institution has from one to three years to comply with the requirement(s) involved. Failure to comply shall result in the institution’s reclassification to corresponding membership (see Bylaw 20.2.5). **If the institution is placed in restricted membership more than one year after its probationary year or without having served a probationary year, the institution shall be required to complete an athletics pro-**

gram assessment using a form approved by the Membership Committee and shall also be provided with the guiding principles to establish a model Division III athletics program.”

B. Constitution: Amend 3.2.4, pages 9-11, by adding new 3.2.4.15, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“3.2.4 Conditions and Obligations of Membership

[3.2.4.1 through 3.2.4.14 unchanged.]

“3.2.4.15 Convention and Regional Rules Seminar Attendance. An active member institution must be represented by a voting delegate at the NCAA Convention Business Session each year and by at least one institutional staff member at the NCAA Regional Rules Seminar at least every three years.

“3.2.4.15.1 One-Year Probationary Period. An institution that fails to meet any portion of the Convention or Regional Rules Seminar attendance requirement shall be placed on probation for the next academic year after noncompliance is discovered by the Membership Committee. An institution shall be afforded the one-year probationary period for failure to comply with the Convention and Regional Rules Seminar attendance requirement only once in every 10-year period. The 10-year period shall begin September 1 after the completion of the academic year in which the membership criterion is not met.

“3.2.4.15.2 Application of Restricted Membership Status. If an institution fails to meet any portion of the Convention and Regional Rules Seminar attendance requirement at the end of the probationary year or is ineligible for the once-in-10-year probationary period, it shall be placed in restricted membership in the first academic year after the probationary year (or the first academic year after failure to meet the requirements if the institution is ineligible for the once-in-10-year probationary period) and shall not be eligible for a number of membership privileges, including championships eligibility, voting privileges, Division III grant and initiative funding and catastrophic-injury insurance during the year of restricted membership. If the institution still cannot certify compliance with the attendance requirement at the end of that year, it shall be reclassified as a corresponding member.

“3.2.4.15.3 Waiver. The Management Council, on recommendation of the Membership Committee,

may grant waivers of Constitution 3.2.4.15 if it deems that unusual circumstances warrant such action."

C. Constitution: Amend 6.3.1, page 42, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"6.3.1 Self-Study Report. Institutions shall conduct a comprehensive self-study and evaluation of their intercollegiate athletics programs at least once every five years, using the Institutional Self-Study Guide (ISSG). The report of the self-study and supporting documentation shall be available for examination on request by an authorized representative of the Association **and may be reviewed by the Membership Committee with a focus on legislative issues and results of action plans in areas of deficiencies.** Subjects covered by the self-study shall include:"

[6.3.1-(a) through 6.3.1-(k) unchanged.]

D. Bylaws: Amend 11, pages 47-48, by adding new 11.7, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"11 Conduct and Employment of Athletics Personnel

[11.01 through 11.5 unchanged.]

"11.6 Division III Rules Test — Annual Requirement. Institutions shall administer the NCAA Division III Rules Test to all head coaches and athletics administrators with compliance responsibilities on an annual basis."

E. Bylaws: Amend 20.02, pages 207-208, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"20.02 DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS

[20.02.1 through 20.02.3 unchanged.]

"20.02.4 Probation. Probation is a membership classification status assigned to an institution which indicates that an institution's membership is not in good standing. The status of probation serves as a warning that certain conditions and obligations of membership have not been satisfied and failure to correct such deficiencies shall result in the institution's reclassification to the category of restricted membership. **During the probationary year, the institution shall be required to complete an athletics program assessment using a form approved by the Membership Committee and shall also be provided with the guiding principles to establish a model Division III athletics program.** An institution does not lose membership benefits as a result of being placed on probation.

"20.02.5 Restricted Membership. Restricted membership is a membership classification status assigned to an institution that fails to comply with the minimum requirements of its division (e.g., sports sponsorship) and has failed during

its period of probation to rectify such deficiencies as identified by the Division III Membership Committee or Committee on Infractions. The institution placed in such status is subject to loss of eligibility for a number of membership privileges, including championships eligibility, voting privileges, Division III grant and initiative funding and catastrophic-injury insurance. The institution has from one year to three years to comply with the requirement involved. Failure to comply shall result in the institution's reclassification to corresponding membership (see Bylaw 20.2.5). **If the institution is placed in restricted membership more than one year after its probationary year or without having served a probationary year, the institution shall be required to complete an athletics program assessment using a form approved by the Membership Committee and shall also be provided with the guiding principles to establish a model Division III athletics program."**

[20.02.6 through 20.02.7 unchanged.]

F. Bylaws: Amend 21.9.6.8, page 236, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"21.9.6.8 Membership Committee

[21.9.6.8.1 unchanged.]

"21.9.6.8.2 Duties. The committee shall review issues related to Division III membership, including issues and educational efforts affecting provisional and continuing members, **monitoring and auditing of sports-sponsorship requirements** and *shall coordinate* educational programs for the membership regarding NCAA legislation."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2007. Any application of membership penalties (probation or restricted membership status) based on the sports-sponsorship audit shall be based on information reported for the 2006-07 year and beyond.

Rationale: This proposal manages the growth of Division III by screening active members and holding those members accountable for membership requirements and significant educational initiatives. Institutions demonstrate a commitment to Division III when representatives attend NCAA-sponsored events (i.e., Convention, Regional Rules Seminar) and conduct thorough self-studies, including the creation of thoughtful action plans. This proposal requires the Membership Committee to track institutional attendance at those events and to monitor ISSG action plans. Requiring annual administration of the Division III rules test will familiarize the Division III head coaches and athletics administrators with key bylaws and will help ensure that coaches and athletics administrators know how to navigate the Divi-

sion III Manual. Institutions will be asked to verify administration of the rules test on the annual sports-sponsorship form so that the Membership Committee may monitor compliance with this requirement. Because of the importance to the division of the broad-based program philosophy, the Membership Committee shall engage in an annual audit of all sports-sponsorship requirements, verifying that institutions have met all such requirements. Audited institutions shall be selected randomly or based on committee concern and prior history and shall include approximately five percent of the Division III membership annually.

Estimated Financial Impact: Division III shall allocate additional funds to Tier I of the Division III Strategic Grant Program. Further, institutions may face increased travel expenditures for sending staff to the NCAA Convention and Regional Rules Seminars. Finally, there will be an increased labor cost for the NCAA national office to facilitate the auditing of completed ISSGs and sports-sponsorship reports.

***NO. 11 (NO. 2-2) DIVISION MEMBERSHIP — MAXIMUM CAPACITY**

Intent: To establish 459 as the maximum number of active, provisional and reclassifying Division III member institutions.

Constitution: Amend 3.1, page 8, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“3.1 ELIGIBILITY FOR MEMBERSHIP.

“3.1.1 General. Membership is available to colleges, universities, athletics conferences or associations and other groups that are related to intercollegiate athletics; that have acceptable academic standards (as defined in Constitution 3.2.3.3), and that are located in the United States, its territories or possessions. Such institutions or organizations must accept and observe the principles set forth in the constitution and bylaws of the Association.

“3.1.1.1 Maximum Size of Division III Membership. The size of the Division III membership shall not exceed 459 active, provisional and reclassifying member institutions.”

[3.1.2 unchanged.]

Source: North Coast Athletic Conference

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: Division III has experienced unprecedented growth since its inception in 1973, expanding from 243 to 450 members as of June 2006, and is the largest playing division in NCAA history. Its membership eclipses the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics’ (NAIA) approximately 300 institutions. Growth

in Division III caused its membership at the 2006 Convention to pass a Presidents Council proposal permanently capping the team sports championship fields at 64 to minimize the time required to conduct tournaments. Unregulated membership growth will begin to strain the staff and revenue allotted to Division III by Association formula. A permanent membership cap addresses this issue as well as the possible failure of the NAIA. A healthy and stable NAIA is in the best interest of Division III. The cap would prevent further drift of NAIA members to Division III. This proposal poses the fundamental question for our future: How large a membership do we want for Division III and why? A permanent membership cap would: (1) serve as a component of a long-range plan for Division III; (2) protect access to NCAA championship fields; (3) stabilize current levels of staff services; (4) preserve our limited percentage of the Association’s revenue; and (5) prevent a hemorrhaging of NAIA members into Division III.

Committee Position (Presidents Council, Management Council and Membership Committee): The Presidents Council, Management Council and Membership Committee oppose this proposal as a membership cap does not adequately address the division’s membership growth issues. Rather, the governance structure prefers a more comprehensive approach to addressing membership growth. The NCAA Executive Committee’s Working Group on Membership Issues continues to review and consider strategies for addressing Association-wide membership growth on a long-term basis. The current membership moratorium (which was enacted by the Presidents Council in October 2005) has been extended at least through the 2008 Convention effectively freezes new membership in Division III while the Working Group and the Division III governance structure comprehensively study long-term membership growth issues. Finally, Division III 2007 Convention Proposal No. 9 further addresses the issue of Division III growth and diversity by admitting only those institutions fully committed to the Division III philosophy and that exhibit the ability to meet all Division III regulations, including sports-sponsorship requirements, for a sustained period of time.

Estimated Financial Impact: The Division III budget shall be distributed over no more than 459 institutions.

***NO. 12 (NO. 2-4) LEGISLATIVE PROCESS — AMENDMENT PROCESS — SPONSORSHIP REQUIREMENTS**

Intent: To increase the sponsorship requirements for membership-sponsored proposals and resolutions to 20 or more active member institutions or two or more voting conferences.

A. Constitution: Amend 5.3.4, page 32, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“5.3.4.1 Amendment. An amendment to a provision of the by-laws may be sponsored by:

“(a) The Presidents Council;

“(b) **Eight Twenty** or more active member institutions with voting privileges, on written verification of sponsorship signed by each sponsoring member’s president or chancellor or the president or chancellor’s designated representative; or

“(c) A **Two or more** member conferences with voting privileges, when submitted by the chief elected or executive officer of the conferences on behalf of *eight or more of its each conference’s* active member institutions and signed by the chairs of the conference’s official presidential administrative groups or at least two *chief executive officers chancellors or presidents* of the conference’s member institutions if the conference has no presidential administrative group.

[5.3.4.1.1 through 5.3.4.1.2 unchanged.]

“5.3.4.2 Amendment-to-Amendment. An amendment to an amendment of a provision of the bylaws may be sponsored by:

“(a) The Presidents Council;

“(b) **Eight Twenty** or more active member institutions with voting privileges, when submitted in writing by each institution’s president or chancellor or the president or chancellor’s designated representative; or

“(c) A **Two or more** member conferences with voting privileges, when submitted in writing by the chief elected or executive officer of the conferences on behalf of *eight or more of its each conference’s* active member institutions and signed by the chairs of the conference’s official presidential administrative groups or at least two *chief executive officers chancellors or presidents* of the conference’s member institutions if the conference has no presidential administrative group.”

[Remainder of 5.3.4 unchanged.]

B. Constitution: Amend 5.4.2.5.1, page 39, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

“5.4.2.5.1 Sponsorship. A resolution related to a federated provision may be sponsored by:

“(a) The Presidents Council;

“(b) **Eight Twenty** or more active member institutions with voting privileges, on written verification of sponsorship signed by each sponsoring member’s president or chancellor or the president or chancellor’s designated representative;

“(c) A **Two or more** member conferences with voting privileges when submitted by the chief elected or executive officer of the conference on behalf of *eight or more of its each conference’s* active member institutions and signed by the chairs of the conference’s official presidential administrative

groups or at least two *chief executive officers chancellors or presidents* of the conference’s member institutions if the conference has no presidential administrative group.”

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: The process of seeking acceptance and support from other institutions and conferences will increase pre-Convention legislative dialogue and improve the quality of legislative concepts submitted for membership vote. In order to protect the membership from special interest legislation, the proposal sponsorship threshold should be greater than the current level of eight institutions, which is less than two percent of the membership. A sponsorship minimum threshold of 20 institutions represents approximately five percent of the Division III membership.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

GENERAL GROUPING

NO. 13 (NO. 2-6) ETHICAL CONDUCT — GAMBLING ACTIVITIES — SANCTIONS — TIMING OF REINSTATEMENT REQUEST

Intent: To eliminate the requirement that a request for reinstatement of a student-athlete’s eligibility may be submitted only on fulfillment of the minimum one-year period of ineligibility for instances in which a student-athlete solicits or accepts a bet or participates in any gambling activity that involves intercollegiate athletics or professional athletics, through a bookmaker, a parlay card or any other method employed by organized gambling.

Bylaws: Amend 10.3.1, page 46, as follows:

“10.3.1 Sanctions. The following sanctions for violations of Bylaw 10.3 shall apply:

[10.3.1-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) A student-athlete who solicits or accepts a bet or participates in any gambling activity that involves intercollegiate athletics or professional athletics, through a bookmaker, a parlay card or any other method employed by organized gambling, shall be ineligible for all regular-season and post-season competition for a minimum of a period of one year from the date of the institution’s determination that a violation has occurred and shall be charged with a loss of a minimum of one season of participation. *A request for reinstatement may be submitted on behalf of a student-athlete who has participated in such activity only upon fulfillment of the minimum condition indicated above.* If the student-athlete

is determined to have been involved in a subsequent violation of any portion of Bylaw 10.3, the student-athlete shall permanently lose all remaining regular-season and postseason eligibility in all sports.”

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediate.

Rationale: This proposal does not reduce or provide any flexibility regarding the imposition of the minimum one-year eligibility penalty in which a student-athlete solicits or accepts a bet or participates in any gambling activity that involves intercollegiate athletics or professional athletics, through a bookmark, a parlay card or any other method employed by organized gambling. The change, however, does address the timing of processing a reinstatement request and allows an institution to submit a request prior to the completion of the minimum one-year period of ineligibility. While the one-year period would remain the minimum penalty and a student-athlete would not be eligible prior to completing this minimum penalty, it is in all parties’ best interest to allow the reinstatement staff to process the request prior to completion of the penalty. Additionally, this change will allow sufficient time for a case to be fully and thoughtfully reviewed without the added pressure of pending competition. Revision of this bylaw is consistent with the committee’s efforts to streamline the student-athlete reinstatement process.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

NO. 14 (NO. 2-14) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — BASKETBALL — ANNUAL EXEMPTIONS — EXHIBITION CONTEST AND PRACTICE SCRIMMAGES

Intent: In basketball, to permit an institution to have the option of exempting from maximum contest limitations two informal practice scrimmages or one informal practice scrimmage and one exhibition contest against a Division I or II opponent.

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.5.3, pages 140-141, as follows:

“17.5.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of basketball contests shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-1):

[17.5.5.3-(a) through 17.5.5.3-(e) unchanged.]

“(f) **Exhibition Contest and Practice Scrimmages. One of the following may be exempted:**

“(1) Two informal practice scrimmages with outside competition; *or in basketball conducted between the first permissible date for on-court practice and the conclusion of the basketball season.*

“(2) **One informal practice scrimmage with outside competition and one exhibition contest against a Division I or II institution conducted on or after October 31 and before the first permissible contest date.**”

[17.5.5.3-(g) unchanged.]

Source: Ohio Athletic Conference, North Coast Athletic Conference and University Athletic Association.

Effective Date: August 1, 2007

Rationale: This proposal allows one exhibition contest to replace one of the two allowable practice scrimmages as an exemption to maximum contest limitations. Thus, it does not add contests to the season since the exhibition would replace an existing annual exemption. In addition, the season length is not extended in any way since the exhibition event was already permitted to occur prior to the first permissible contest date. Finally, the proposal does not require additional institutional expenditure and provides increased opportunity for Division III institutions to conduct exhibition contests against Division I or II opponents.

Committee Position (Presidents Council, Management Council and Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee): The Presidents Council, Management Council and Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee support this proposal noting the flexibility provided to institutions to schedule exhibition contests against Division I or II institutions without extending the playing season or overall number of basketball contests.

Estimated Financial Impact: None.

	Proposal 1	end debate 2	Refer 2	Proposal 3	Proposal 4	Proposal 5	Refer Proposal 6	Proposal 7	Proposal 8	Proposal 9	Proposal 10	Proposal 12
Adrian College	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Agnes Scott College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Albertus Magnus College	N	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	A
Albion College	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	A	N
Albright College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Alfred University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Allegheny College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Alma College	Y	Y	N				Y				Y	
Alvernia College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Alverno College	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
American Southwest Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Amherst College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Anderson University (Indiana)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Anna Maria College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Arcadia University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Atlantic Women's Colleges Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Augsburg College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Augustana College (Illinois)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
Aurora University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Austin College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Averett University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Babson College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Baldwin-Wallace College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Baptist Bible College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bard College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Baruch College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Bates College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Bay Path College	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Becker College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	Y
Beloit College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Benedictine University (Illinois)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bethel University (Minnesota)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Blackburn College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bluffton University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A

Bowdoin College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Brandeis University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Bridgewater College (Virginia)	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bridgewater State College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Brooklyn College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Bryn Mawr College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Buena Vista University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Buffalo State College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y
Cabrini College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
California Institute of Technology	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
California Lutheran University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
California State University- East Bay	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
Calvin College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Capital Athletic Conference Inc.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Capital University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Carleton College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Carnegie Mellon University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Carroll College (Wisconsin)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
Carthage College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Case Western Reserve University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Castleton State College	N	Y	Y	A	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Catholic University	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Cazenovia College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cedar Crest College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Centenary College (New Jersey)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Centennial Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Central College (Iowa)	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Centre College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Chapman University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Chatham College	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	N	N	N				
Chestnut Hill College	A	A	A	A	A	A		A	A	A	A	A
Chowan University												
Christopher Newport University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y		Y
City College of New York	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
City University of New York Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Claremont McKenna-Harvey												
Mudd-Scripps Colleges	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Clark University (Massachusetts)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Clarkson University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Coe College	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Colby College	N	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N	N
Colby-Sawyer College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
College Conference of Illinois &	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y

Wisconsin													
College Misericordia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
College of Mount St. Joseph	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
College of Mount St. Vincent	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
College of New Rochelle	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
College of Notre Dame (Maryland)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
College of Saint Elizabeth	N	Y		Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
College of St. Benedict	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
College of St. Catherine	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	N
College of St. Scholastica	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
College of Staten Island	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
College of Wooster	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Colorado College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Commonwealth Coast Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Concordia College- Moorhead	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Concordia University (Illinois)	N									Y	A		
Concordia University (Wisconsin)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Concordia University at Austin	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Connecticut College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Cornell College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Curry College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Defiance College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Denison University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DePauw University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DeSales University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Dickinson College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Drew University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
D'Youville College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Earlham College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Eastern Connecticut State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Eastern Mennonite University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Eastern Nazarene College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		Y	Y	Y
Eastern University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Edgewood College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Elizabethtown College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Elmhurst College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Elmira College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Elms College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Emerson College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Emmanuel College (Massachusetts)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Emory University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Empire 8	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Endicott College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N

Eureka College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y							
Fairleigh Dickinson University- Florham	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Ferrum College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Finlandia University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	
Fisk University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	
Fitchburg State College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	
Fontbonne University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Framingham State College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	
Franklin & Marshall College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Franklin College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Frostburg State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	
Gallaudet University													
George Fox University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Gettysburg College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Gordon College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Goucher College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
Great Northeast Athletic Conference	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	
Greenville College	Y		N		N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	
Grinnell College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	
Grove City College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	N	N	N	Y	
Guilford College	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	
Gustavus Adolphus College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	
Gwynedd-Mercy College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Hamilton College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	
Hamline University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y								
Hampden-Sydney College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Hanover College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Hardin-Simmons University	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Haverford College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	
Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Heidelberg College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		
Hendrix College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Hilbert College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N		Y	
Hiram College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Hobart and William Smith Colleges	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Hollins University	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	N	
Hood College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	
Hope College	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Hunter College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	
Huntingdon College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	
Husson College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	

Illinois College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Illinois Wesleyan University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Immaculata University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Iowa Intercol. Athletic Conf.	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ithaca College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
John Carroll University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Johns Hopkins University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
Johnson and Wales University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	A	N
Johnson State College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Kalamazoo College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kean University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Keene State College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Kenyon College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Keuka College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
King's College (Pennsylvania)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Knox College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
La Grange College	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
La Roche College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Lake Erie College	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Lake Forest College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Lasell College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Lawrence University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Lebanon Valley College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Lehman College- City University of New York	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lesley University	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Lewis & Clark College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Liberty League	Y	Y	A	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lincoln University (Pennsylvania)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Linfield College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Little East Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Loras College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Louisiana College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y		N	N
Luther College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Lycoming College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Lynchburg College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Macalester College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
MacMurray College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Maine Maritime Academy	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Manchester College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Manhattanville College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Marian College (Wisconsin)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	
Marietta College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Marymount University (Virginia)	N	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Maryville College (Tennessee)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y

Maryville University of Saint Louis	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Marywood University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Massachusetts Maritime Academy	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
McDaniel College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
McMurry University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Medaille College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Meredith College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	N
Messiah College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Methodist College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Michigan Intercol. Ath. Assn.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Corp.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Middlebury College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Midwest Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Millikin University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Mills College	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Millsaps College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Milwaukee School of Engineering	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Montclair State University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Moravian College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Mount Holyoke College	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Mount Ida College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Mount St. Mary College (New York)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mount Union College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Muhlenberg College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Muskingum College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nazareth College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nebraska Wesleyan University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Neumann College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
New England College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
New England Small College Athletic Conference	N	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
New England Women's & Men's Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
New Jersey Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
New York City College of	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y

Technology													
New York State Women's Collegiate Athletic Assoc.	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
New York University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Newbury College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Nichols College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
North Atlantic Conference	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	
North Central College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
North Coast Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	A	
North Eastern Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
North Park University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Northern Athletic Conference	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Northland College	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Northwest Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Norwich University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Oberlin College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Occidental College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Oglethorpe University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	
Ohio Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Ohio Northern University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Ohio Wesleyan University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Old Dominion Athletic Conf.		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	
Olivet College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Otterbein College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Pacific Lutheran University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	
Pacific University (Oregon)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Penn State University- Altoona	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	
Pennsylvania Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Pennsylvania State Univ. Erie- the Behrend College	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	
Philadelphia Biblical University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	
Piedmont College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Plattsburgh State University of New York	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Plymouth State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	
Polytechnic University (New York)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Pomona-Pitzer Colleges	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	
Presidents' Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	N	N	N	Y	
Principia College	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Ramapo College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	
Randolph-Macon College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Randolph-Macon Woman's College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
Regis College (Massachusetts)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	

Rhode Island College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Rhodes College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Richard Stockton College of New Jersey	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ripon College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Rivier College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Roanoke College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Rochester Institute of Technology	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rockford College	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Roger Williams University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Rosemont College	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Rowan University	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
Russell Sage College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Rust College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
Rutgers- The State Univ. of New Jersey- Camden	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Rutgers- The State Univ. of New Jersey- Newark	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Saint Joseph's College (Maine)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Saint Mary's College (Indiana)	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Saint Mary's University of Minnesota	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Salem State College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Salisbury University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Salve Regina University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Schreiner University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Shenandoah University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	N	Y	N	A	N
Simpson College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Skidmore College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Skyline Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Smith College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conf.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southern Vermont College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Southwestern University (Texas)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Spelman College	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Springfield College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. John Fisher College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. John's University (Minnesota)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
St. Joseph College (Connecticut)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
St. Joseph's College (Long Island)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N

St. Lawrence University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
St. Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Mary's College of Maryland	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
St. Norbert College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
St. Olaf College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
State University College at Brockport	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University College at Cortland	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University College at Fredonia	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
State University College at Geneseo	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University College at New Paltz	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University College at Old Westbury	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University College at Oneonta	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University College at Potsdam	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
State University of New York at Farmingdale	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University of New York at Oswego	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
State University of New York Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
State University of New York Institute of Technology	N	Y	N	Y		Y	Y	N	Y			
State University of New York Maritime College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Stevens Institute of Technology	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Suffolk University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Sul Ross State University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Susquehanna University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Swarthmore College	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	N
Sweet Briar College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Texas Lutheran University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
The College of New Jersey	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thiel College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Thomas College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	N	Y
Thomas More College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Transylvania University	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Trinity College (Connecticut)	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Trinity College (District of	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y

Columbia)													
Trinity University (Texas)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tufts University	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
U.S. Coast Guard Academy	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
U.S. Merchant Marine Academy	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Union College (New York)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University Athletic Association	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y			N
University of California- Santa Cruz	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Chicago	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
University of Dallas	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Dubuque	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of La Verne	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Maine- Farmington	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
University of Mary Hardin-Baylor	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
University of Mary Washington	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
University of Massachusetts- Boston	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
University of Massachusetts- Dartmouth	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y			N
University of New England	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Pittsburgh- Bradford	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
University of Puget Sound	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
University of Redlands	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Rochester	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
University of Scranton	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
University of Southern Maine	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
University of St. Thomas (Minnesota)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
University of Texas at Dallas	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of the Ozarks (Arkansas)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of the South	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
University of Wisconsin- Eau Claire	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin- La Crosse	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin- Oshkosh	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin- Platteville	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
University of Wisconsin- River Falls	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
University of Wisconsin- Stevens Point	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Wisconsin- Stout	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
University of Wisconsin- Superior	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ursinus College	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
USA South Athletic Conference	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	A	Y
Utica College	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Vassar College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Villa Julie College	Y	Y	Y		N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Virginia Wesleyan College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wabash College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wartburg College	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Washington and Jefferson College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Washington and Lee University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Washington College (Maryland)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
Washington University (Missouri)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Waynesburg College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Webster University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Wellesley College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Wells College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wentworth Institute of Technology	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wesley College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Wesleyan College (Georgia)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y		Y	N
Wesleyan University (Connecticut)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Western Connecticut State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Western New England College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Westfield State College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Westminster College (Missouri)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	A	Y	Y	A
Westminster College (Pennsylvania)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Wheaton College (Illinois)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Wheaton College (Massachusetts)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Whitman College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Whittier College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Whitworth College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Widener University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wilkes University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Willamette University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
William Paterson University of New Jersey	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Williams College	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Wilmington College (Ohio)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Wilson College	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wisconsin Lutheran College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N

Wittenberg University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Worcester Polytechnic Institute	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Worcester State College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	N
Yeshiva University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
York College (New York)	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
York College (Pennsylvania)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
YES	329	420	329	380	365	317	359	82	319	367	328	240
NO	96	6	87	39	57	98	62	336	100	51	88	177
ABSTAIN	4	1	3	3	4	9	3	5	5	4	6	5
TOTAL	429	427	419	422	426	424	424	423	424	422	422	422

The NCAA salutes the more than
380,000 student-athletes
participating in **23 sports** at
more than **1,000** member institutions

